

CASE NO. 08cv1589

ATTACHMENT NO. 4

EXHIBIT \_\_\_\_\_

TAB (DESCRIPTION) \_\_\_\_\_

1 person--

2 THE COURT: Just a minute.

3 The objection is sustained.

4 MS. PLACEK: Q Well, let's go a step  
5 further.

6 You found out about certain other male  
7 relatives, correct, of this alleged victim,  
8 correct?

9 A I don't understand the question.

10 Q Well, did you find out about a step-  
11 grandfather?

12 A I don't recall.

13 Q Do you recall if you found out about the  
14 name of Johnson?

15 A Denise Johnson?

16 Q No, Johnson. George.

17 A Oh, I don't know.

18 Can you refresh my memory on that?

19 Q Well, did you find out about a Harding  
20 Johnson (phonetics)?

21 A Is that in my report there?

22 Q I'm asking you, Officer:

23 In your investigation --

24 A I don't recall.

1                   But if you can show me something that I  
2   did --

3           Q       Did you, in fact, find out from Carolyn  
4   McCoy that in fact there was a family altercation  
5   with Denise Johnson, between her and Mrs. Hill?

6           A       Did I find this out?

7           Q       Did you find that out?

8           A       Not that I know of.

9           Q       Officer, showing you what would be  
10   previously marked -- And I believe this was part  
11   of the group Exhibit referring directly to Carolyn  
12   McCoy, is that in fact contained within the  
13   report?

14          A       This is not a report, no.

15          Q       Not your report. But as a group of the  
16   reports that you said you reviewed?

17          A       I don't remember seeing this one, no.

18          Q       Well, Officer --

19          A       If it was there, I don't remember seeing  
20   this one.

21          Q       Officer, isn't it correct that Carolyn  
22   McCoy told in fact the Chicago Police Department  
23   that there was an altercation between Mrs. Hill  
24   and the family and Denise Johnson, and that is

1 when she in fact walked off toward 119th Street?

2 MR. RONKOWSKI: Objection.

3 THE WITNESS: A It doesn't say what the  
4 altercation was.

5 THE COURT: Wait a minute.

6 MR. RONKOWSKI: She is trying to impeach this  
7 officer with another officer's report.

8 THE COURT: She is trying to elicit from him  
9 substantive evidence, as I understand it.

10 And the knowledge of this police  
11 officer, or any other police officer, is relevant  
12 because this police officer can rely upon  
13 information known to other police officers,  
14 whether it had been communicated to him or not in  
15 substantiating probable cause.

16 It can likewise be used by the Defendant  
17 to show that the knowledge of the police  
18 department and not just one particular police  
19 officer disputed probable cause.

20 The pendulum swings both ways. The  
21 objection is overruled.

22 THE WITNESS: A The family altercation Mrs.  
23 McCoy told us about, she told us that Jerome was  
24 on the porch. and she told him not to talk to

1 her.

2 MS. PLACEK: Q When you say family  
3 altercation, that is not what is down here, is it?

4 A That is what she was talking about.

5 Q Is that down there in black and white,  
6 Officer?

7 A That is what she considered a family  
8 altercation.

9 Q That is what you are telling us today?

10 A What is it, then?

11 Q Well, let's talk a little further.

12 Isn't it correct that, quote, Mrs. McCoy  
13 and Miss Hill had told the Chicago Police  
14 Department that this young lady was boy crazy, or  
15 man crazy?

16 A I don't remember that.

17 Q Well, isn't it correct that in fact on  
18 the missing person's report, where it says  
19 interest, meaning the missing person, it is down  
20 there, boys and men?

21 A Not in my report.

22 Q Well, Officer, do you know if it is down  
23 there?

24 A I don't know, ma'am.

1 Q Officer, showing you what would be  
2 marked as Defendant's Exhibit No. 7, or  
3 Petitioner's No. 7.

4 Will you tell his Honor what this is?

5 A This is a missing case report.

6 Q Does that show an interest of this young  
7 lady, as put down by the Chicago Police  
8 Department?

9 A Yes.

10 Q What is it?

11 A It says boys.

12 Q Officer, when was that report taken?

13 A The report was originally taken on the  
14 2nd of August.

15 This here is signed on the 5th of  
16 August.

17 Q Showing you what in fact would be marked  
18 as Petitioner's No. 8.

19 A Uh-huh.

20 Q Does that in fact -- What does that  
21 purport to be?

22 A Report on the missing.

23 Q Does that also show an interest of the  
24 young lady?

1 A Yes.

2 Q What was her interest?

3 A It says men.

4 Q Thank you.

5 By the way, showing you again No. 7.

6 Does that report purport to say who in fact the  
7 guardian of the young lady is?

8 A Estella Fields.

9 Q Thank you.

10 As a matter of fact, isn't it correct  
11 that you had information at the time of your  
12 investigation that in fact when Jerome Hendricks  
13 was on the porch on the 1st, and told to go away,  
14 he simply went away?

15 A That is correct.

16 Q There was no fight between him and  
17 Yolanda Hill, or -- excuse me, Estelle Hill and  
18 Yolanda Hill about him staying, correct?

19 A That is correct.

20 Q As a matter of fact, the only fight was  
21 between the aunt and the young girl, is that  
22 correct?

23 A I don't know anything about the fight,  
24 other than what was in that report.

1 Q Well, the fight is not with Jerome  
2 Hendricks present, correct?

3 A I don't know.

4 I would have to look at the report,  
5 ma'am.

6 Q As a matter of fact, would it also be  
7 correct in saying that the Chicago Police at the  
8 time knew that her male relatives, her step-  
9 grandfather and her father would be uncooperative  
10 because both Miss Hill and Miss Fields complained  
11 that once she had gone away before and stayed with  
12 them, that they in fact lied to the Fields, the  
13 guardians, as to her whereabouts?

14 MR. RONKOWSKI: Objection, compound question.

15 THE COURT: It is compound.

16 MS. PLACEK: I will withdraw it.

17 THE COURT: You don't have to withdraw it.

18 If the witness understands, he may  
19 answer.

20 THE WITNESS: I don't understand.

21 MS. PLACEK: Surely.

22 Q Did you know whether or not there was a  
23 grandfather involved in this case?

24 A I don't recall.



1 Q Officer, do you know what the Chicago  
2 Police Department did?

3 A I don't know, ma'am.

4 Q Showing you what would be marked as  
5 Petitioner's Exhibit No. 9 for Identification.  
6 What does that purport to do?

7 Is this the same missing --

8 A No, it isn't. It is a different  
9 missing report.

10 Q Showing you the back of that report,  
11 doesn't it show that in fact the Chicago Police  
12 Department had information about this young lady  
13 not only liking the company of older men --

14 A I would have to read it first.

15 Q Go ahead.

16 Have you read it now?

17 A No, I have not.

18 Q Well, not meaning to interrupt your  
19 reading.

20 But would it be correct in saying that  
21 at the time you felt the defendant was supposed to  
22 be talking to you, that you had none of this  
23 information?

24 A I don't remember seeing this at all.

1 Q Or the other report about her being  
2 interested in men?

3 A No.

4 Q Or about her mother being a drug addict?

5 A I don't even remember seeing all these  
6 reports yet, no.

7 I may have gotten them later.

8 Q So you felt that the defendant had to be  
9 talked to without all of this information,  
10 correct?

11 A If he was seen with her on the 1st,  
12 maybe he had seen who she left with. Not  
13 necessarily he was the last to see her alive, but  
14 maybe the last one I knew.

15 Q So now you are saying that maybe he was  
16 not the last one that saw her alive?

17 A The last one I know.

18 Q Now, you know the Chicago Police  
19 Department knew differently now, don't you?

20 A According to these.

21 Q Thank you.

22 A I don't know if they are accurate or  
23 not.

24 Q Oh, they might be mistaken, correct?

1 A I --

2 MR. RONKOWSKI: Objection. Counsel is  
3 arguing with the witness.

4 THE COURT: Sustained.

5 MS. PLACEK: Q Officer, isn't it correct  
6 that there is information in that report that the  
7 victim had male relatives who would not cooperate  
8 with her guardian?

9 A That's what it says.

10 Q Not only that, but sheltered her when  
11 she ran away?

12 A I don't remember seeing that.

13 Is that in there, too?

14 Q It states having previously assisted  
15 Denise, Mrs. Fields wishes --

16 MR. RONKOWSKI: Objection.

17 THE WITNESS: I don't remember if it says  
18 anything about shelter in there.

19 MS. PLACEK: I'm sorry.

20 Q Then let me withdraw and rephrase.

21 Shelter -- Or, excuse me, assisting  
22 Denise.

23 Isn't it correct that the Chicago Police  
24 Department that time knew that there was, or was

1 told by her legal guardian, that there were male  
2 relatives who they might as well not even bother  
3 speaking to, because they in fact assisted Denise  
4 against Mrs. Fields' wishes?

5 MR. RONKOWSKI: Objection.

6 THE COURT: Basis?

7 MR. RONKOWSKI: First of all, you can't  
8 impeach an officer with another officer's report.

9 Second of all, that piece of information  
10 does not negate any probable cause.

11 MS. PLACEK: Judge --

12 THE COURT: The objection is overruled.

13 MS. PLACEK: Thank you.

14 Q Correct?

15 THE WITNESS: A Assist? I don't know what  
16 you mean by assist.

17 I don't know what the assist was.

18 Q Well, isn't it correct that Mrs. Fields  
19 says that as a matter of fact, you might as well  
20 not even talk to them, correct, if you know, Mrs.  
21 Fields?

22 A I don't know.

23 Q Well, let's go further.

24 According to your statement when you

1 came in fact to the home of Jerome Hendricks, who  
2 was present?

3 A Who was present when I got there?

4 Q Yes.

5 A I don't know, ma'am. He was home.

6 Q Besides him?

7 A I don't know who the people were.

8 Q Was his mother home?

9 How many people were present in the  
10 house?

11 A There were several people there.

12 Q How many were women?

13 A I don't know.

14 Q By the way, are you the supervising  
15 officer in this case?

16 A I don't know what you consider  
17 supervising officer.

18 Q Are you the investigating officer in  
19 this case?

20 A I am a detective, right.

21 Q Let me ask you this.

22 You didn't take any names of anyone  
23 present at that time?

24 A No.

1 Q You don't know whether they were women?

2 A Correct.

3 Q Did you Mirandize him at his home?

4 A No.

5 Q Officer, when do you Mirandize people?

6 May I withdraw?

7 Isn't it correct that you Mirandize  
8 people as incidents of an arrest?

9 MR. RONKOWSKI: Objection.

10 THE COURT: Sustained.

11 MS. PLACEK: Q Well, when do you Mirandize  
12 people?

13 MR. RONKOWSKI: Objection, irrelevant.

14 THE COURT: Sustained.

15 Well, I don't know. It may go to his  
16 state of mind.

17 I will overrule your objection.

18 MS. PLACEK: Q Well, Judge, I will move  
19 away.

20 THE COURT: The objection is overruled.

21 MS. PLACEK: Q You said the defendant  
22 attempted to call Russ Ewing from the police  
23 station?

24 THE WITNESS: A He told me. I don't know

1 if he did or not.

2 Q Well, you said to the Assistant State's  
3 Attorney, you said you were close to him when he  
4 was making the call?

5 A I was not listening to who he was  
6 talking to.

7 Q What time of the day or night was that?

8 A I think it was -- In my notes, it was  
9 two hundred -- It would be about 9:15, I think,  
10 9:30.

11 Q That's 9:30 in the evening, correct?

12 A 9:15 or 9:30.

13 Q Was he arrested?

14 A No.

15 Q Did you ask him why he wanted to call a  
16 newspaper man -- Strike that -- a TV man, when  
17 there was no problem at the police station and he  
18 was there consensually?

19 A Yes, I did ask him why.

20 Q And did he in fact not call Russ Ewing  
21 there, but had someone call Russ Ewing at the  
22 house?

23 A He made two phone calls.

24 He told me he called Ewing and his

1 mother. Now, whether he did or not, I don't  
2 know.

3 Q Well, Russ Ewing did show up eventually,  
4 did he, at the police station -- If you know.

5 A I don't recall seeing him at the police  
6 station.

7 Q But you do know that Russ Ewing did in  
8 fact get in contact with the police?

9 A I seen Russ Ewing on the scene before I  
10 came into the office.

11 Before I went to his house, to Jerome's  
12 house. I saw him earlier around 6:00 o'clock or  
13 so.

14 Q As a matter of fact, the real time you  
15 saw Russ Ewing is after the arrest of the  
16 defendant, is that correct?

17 MR. RONKOWSKI: Objection.

18 THE COURT: Overruled.

19 Well, you are talking about after his  
20 arrest?

21 MR. RONKOWSKI: Yes.

22 MS. PLACEK: Withdraw it.

23 Q Isn't it in fact true that you in fact  
24 saw Russ Ewing at the police station between about



1 8:00 o'clock and 8:30 at night?

2 THE WITNESS: A Isn't it a fact?

3 Q Yes. If you can recall.

4 A No, it is not a fact.

5 Q Thank you.

6 By the way, did you wonder why he was  
7 calling Russ Ewing from the police station, since  
8 you had treated him so well, and he was not under  
9 arrest, and free to leave, is that correct?

10 A Yes.

11 Q What was his answer?

12 A He wanted to ask Russ if he should take  
13 a lie detector test or not.

14 Q Well, did you ask whether he was  
15 personal friends with Russ?

16 A No.

17 Q Did you ask why not call a lawyer  
18 instead?

19 A I had no idea why he wanted to call  
20 Russ, and it didn't matter to me who he wanted to  
21 call.

22 If he wanted to call someone, he was  
23 going to call them.

24 Q Officer, isn't it correct that the

1 defendant was arrested at his house?

2 A No, it is not, ma'am.

3 Q Isn't it correct that his mother, in  
4 fact, fought you and the other Chicago police  
5 officers, asking why you were handcuffing her boy?

6 A No, ma'am.

7 Q Isn't it correct in fact that you pushed  
8 past his mother and his sister into the living  
9 room during the altercation with the defendant?

10 A No, ma'am.

11 Q Isn't it correct that in fact, during  
12 this altercation, that you and other members, you  
13 and other members of the Chicago Police  
14 Department, in an effort to handcuff him, swore at  
15 him and in fact engaged in a physical struggle?

16 A No, ma'am.

17 MS. PLACEK: May I have a moment, Judge?

18 THE COURT: Surely.

19 (After a short period of time)

20 MS. PLACEK: Q By the way, you never  
21 interviewed the defendant, did you?

22 A Yes, I did.

23 Q Who are Baker and Sorany (phonetics)?

24 A They are detectives in Area 2.

1 Q Showing you what would be marked as  
2 Defendant's Exhibit No. 11, I believe you  
3 previously identified this as your report,  
4 correct?

5 A That's only page 2.

6 No, this is not my report.

7 Q Well, doesn't it in fact state that the  
8 defendant was interviewed by Detectives Sorany,  
9 and Baker, after first being advised of his  
10 rights?

11 A It says that.

12 MS. PLACEK: That's all.

13 THE COURT: Redirect?  
14

15 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

16 BY

17 MS. MALLO:

18 Q You testified that the victim was  
19 staying with a Carolyn McCoy?

20 A Yes.

21 Q Where was Carolyn's home from the body,  
22 where the victim was found?

23 MS. PLACEK: Objection.

24 MR. RONKOWSKI: Probable cause, the

1 proximity of the location to where the body was  
2 found.

3 MS. PLACEK: Improper redirect.

4 THE COURT: It was brought up.

5 We went over this in direct examination,  
6 did we not?

7 I will let you answer the question. But  
8 we can be here all night answering redirect  
9 questions.

10 I understand the direct testimony. The  
11 objection is overruled.

12 THE WITNESS: A The body was located  
13 next door to where Jerome Hendricks lived.

14 MS. MALLO: Q And had the victim been dead  
15 for a while?

16 A Yes.

17 MS. PLACEK: Objection.

18 THE COURT: Sustained.

19 MS. MALLO: And Detective, was the family  
20 altercation you spoke of because the victim was  
21 seeing the defendant?

22 MS. PLACEK: Objection.

23 He said he didn't know what it was  
24 about.

1 THE COURT: Sustained.

2 MS. MALLO: Q And, Detective, you testified  
3 on cross examination that the defendant made two  
4 phone calls?

5 A That is correct, at the Area.

6 Q And after he made those phone calls, did  
7 he then tell you that he wished to take a  
8 polygraph test?

9 A Yes, he did.

10 MS. PLACEK: Objection, irrelevant, Judge.

11 MR. RONKOWSKI: Goes toward his consent to be  
12 there.

13 MS. PLACEK: Judge --

14 THE COURT: No. that is precisely what the  
15 cases hold.

16 The objection is overruled nonetheless.  
17 But the fact that he agreed to take the polygraph  
18 does not relate back and make what was otherwise  
19 an illegal arrest legal, or anything that flowed.

20 In other words, it doesn't attenuate  
21 the taint.

22 As a matter of fact, the cases hold in  
23 People versus Franklin, in Illinois, hold that the  
24 agreement to take the polygraph is a part of the

1 taint, as opposed to attenuating. It flows  
2 naturally from the taint of the illegal arrest.  
3 So says Franklin.

4 But I will let you answer the question.  
5 Let him answer the question for whatever it is  
6 worth.

7 THE WITNESS: A He said he wanted to take  
8 the polygraph exam to clear his name so he could  
9 tell the people in the neighborhood that he did  
10 not have anything to do with this crime.

11 MS. MALLO: Nothing further.

12 THE COURT: Recross?

13 MS. PLACEK: Not a thing, Judge.

14 (Witness excused)

15 THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, I am going  
16 to continue this matter for another date.

17 Can you agree on a date?

18 MR. RONKOWSKI: I can agree on any day that  
19 Counsel wants to come back to this courtroom.

20 I will check with the witnesses before  
21 they leave to make sure they can be back here.

22 MS. PLACEK: March the 7th?

23 THE COURT: March the 7th?

24 MS. PLACEK: Yes.

1 Is that okay?

2 MR. RONKOWSKI: March the 7th is fine.

3 THE COURT: Order the Court, March the 7th.  
4 with subpoenas.

5 (Thereupon, said cause was continued  
6 to Wednesday, March 7, 1990, at 9:30  
7 o'clock a.m.)

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 STATE OF ILLINOIS )  
2 ) SS:  
COUNTY OF C O O K )

3 IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS  
4 COUNTY DEPARTMENT-CRIMINAL DIVISION

5 THE PEOPLE OF THE )  
6 STATE OF ILLINOIS )  
7 -vs- ) No. 88 CR 12517  
8 JEROME HENDRICKS )

9 REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had of the hearing  
10 of the above-entitled cause, before the Honorable  
11 LEO E. HOLT, Judge of said court, on the 7th day  
12 of March, A. D. 1990.

13 APPEARANCES:

14 HON. CECIL A. PARTEE,  
15 State's Attorney of Cook County, by:  
16 MR. EDWARD RONKOWSKI,  
Assistant State's Attorney,  
17 appeared on behalf of the People;

18 HON. RANDOLPH N. STONE,  
19 Public Defender of Cook County, by:  
MR. VINCENT LUFRANO,  
Assistant Public Defender,  
20 appeared on behalf of the Defendant.



1 THE CLERK: Sheet 1, Line 21, Jerome Hendricks  
2 in custody.

3 MR. RONKOWSKI: Your Honor, I had two phone  
4 conversations with Marijane Placek, the attorney  
5 representing Jerome Hendricks. She got tied up on  
6 a hearing that she thought she could finish this  
7 morning. She hadn't even started when I talked  
8 to her at lunch time.

9 She's requesting a Motion Defendant to  
10 3-13-90, for one o'clock in the afternoon.

11 THE COURT: Do you understand, Mr. Hendricks?

12 DEFENDANT HENDRICKS: Yes, sir.

13 THE COURT: Motion Defendant March 13, one p.m.

14  
15 (Whereupon the matter was  
16 continued to March 13,  
17 1990, at 1:00 p.m.)  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

1 STATE OF ILLINOIS )  
2 ) SS:  
3 COUNTY OF C O O K )

4 IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY  
5 COUNTY DEPARTMENT-CRIMINAL DIVISION

6 THE PEOPLE OF THE )  
7 STATE OF ILLINOIS )  
8 ) NO. 88 CR 12517  
9 VERSUS )  
10 ) CHARGE: Murder  
11 JEROME HENDRICKS )

12 REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

13 BE IT REMEMBERED that on the 13th day of  
14 March, A. D., 1990, this cause came on before the  
15 Honorable LEO HOLT, Judge of said Court, upon the  
16 Information herein, the defendant having entered a plea  
17 of not guilty.

18 APPEARANCES:

19 HON. CECIL PARTEE,  
20 State's Attorney of Cook County, by  
21 MS. MARY MALLO,  
22 Assistant State's Attorney,  
23 appeared on behalf of the People;

24 MR. VINCENT LUFRANO,  
Assistant Public Defender,  
appeared on behalf of the Defendant.

Reported by:

MS. BETTE N. SACKS, C. S. R.  
Certified Shorthand Reporter,  
Circuit Court of Cook County.

1 THE CLERK: Jerome Hendricks, in custody.

2 THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Hendricks.

3 MR. HENDRICKS: Morning.

4 THE COURT: The Court is on trial, Mr. Hendricks,  
5 with a jury, and will not be able to proceed further with  
6 your motions today.

7 MR. HENDRICKS: Yes, sir.

8 THE COURT: Your attorney has called the court, and  
9 has been advised of that, and I think has agreed to a  
10 date where we can go back to the hearing in your case.

11 MR. HENDRICKS: Okay.

12 THE COURT: What date was agreed on?

13 MS. MALLO: March 29, Judge.

14 THE COURT: By agreement. Mr. Lufrano is here on  
15 this case.

16 By agreement March 29. See you then, Mr.  
17 Hendricks.

18 (Thereupon said cause was continued  
19 to Marcy 29, 1990, at 9:30 o'clock a.m.)  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

1 STATE OF ILLINOIS )  
2 ) SS:  
3 COUNTY OF C O O K )

4 IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY  
5 COUNTY DEPARTMENT-CRIMINAL DIVISION

6 THE PEOPLE OF THE )  
7 STATE OF ILLINOIS ) NO.88 CR 12517  
8 )  
9 VERSUS ) CHARGE: Murder, Agg.  
10 ) Crim. Conc. Hom. Death,  
11 JEROME HENDRICKS ) Agg. Kid., Unl. Rest.

12 MOTION TO QUASH ARREST AND SUPPRESS STATEMENTS

13 BE IT REMEMBERED that on Thursday,  
14 March the 29th, A.D. 1990, this cause came on for  
15 hearing before the Honorable LEO HOLT, Judge  
16 of said Court.

17 APPEARANCES:

18 HON. CECIL PARTEE,  
19 State's Attorney of Cook County, by  
20 MR. EDWARD RONKOWSKI, MS. MARY MALLO,  
21 Assistant State's Attorneys  
22 appeared for the People;

23 MR. RANDOLPH STONE,  
24 Public Defender of Cook County, by  
MS. MARIJANE PLACEK, MS. PATRICIA COURSON  
Assistant Public Defenders  
appeared for the Defendant.

ROBERT LIEF, C.S.R.,  
Official Court Reporter  
Markham, IL 60426

1 THE CLERK: Sheet 2, Line 18, Jerome  
2 Hendricks, in custody.

3 MS. PLACEK: Good afternoon, your Honor.

4 I'm sorry I was a little late this  
5 morning.

6 THE COURT: That's all right.

7 MR. RONKOWSKI: Can I get my file?

8 MS. PLACEK: Your Honor, for the purpose of  
9 the record, Marijane, M-a-r-i-j-a-n-e, Placek,  
10 P-l-a-c-e-k, representing the defendant, Mr.  
11 Hendricks, who is now standing before the Court.

12 To refresh your Honor's memory, on an  
13 earlier court date, evidence was taken, in fact  
14 taken on a Motion to Quash Arrest.

15 I believe we are in the middle of that  
16 motion, the State's side.

17 THE COURT: Right.

18 We will see where we are going when Mr.  
19 Ronkowski returns to the courtroom, which is  
20 momentary.

21 Are you both ready?

22 MR. RONKOWSKI: The State is.

23 MS. PLACEK: Yes, Judge. I am also.

24 THE COURT: You and Mr. Hendricks may be

1 seated at Counsel table while I see if I can  
2 locate my notes.

3 MS. PLACEK: Judge, I'm getting my briefcase  
4 out of the conference room.

5 MR. RONKOWSKI: The last witness that  
6 testified was Larry Nitsche.

7 THE COURT: What date?

8 MR. RONKOWSKI: February 27th.

9 THE CLERK: Yes, Judge, it was February 27th.

10 THE COURT: What was the name of your last  
11 witness?

12 MR. RONKOWSKI: Larry Nitsche.

13 He testified February 27th.

14 MS. PLACEK: I also would be ordering a  
15 transcript of the proceedings, if the Court has no  
16 objection I would --

17 THE COURT: I'm just trying to find out where  
18 we are standing.

19 MS. PLACEK: I understand.

20 Your Honor, for the purposes of the  
21 record, if I may interrupt the Court, this is Miss  
22 Pat Courson.

23 She is going to help me. She is a  
24 licensed attorney to practice law in the State of

1 Illinois. She is going to be helping me today  
2 because I understand that Mr. Lufrano has a motion  
3 himself today.

4 THE COURT: So you are new Counsel today.

5 MS. PLACEK: Thank you, your Honor.

6 THE COURT: In whose court is the ball?

7 MS. PLACEK: I believe it's the State's.

8 MR. RONKOWSKI: I am ready to call two more  
9 witnesses today.

10 THE COURT: Call your next.

11 MR. RONKOWSKI: The State would call Jim  
12 Hill.

13 (Witness sworn)

14 MS. PLACEK: If it pleases the Court, Judge,  
15 Mr. Ronkowski, I believe is anticipating the  
16 objection.

17 The gentleman who is about to testify  
18 is, of course, a civilian. Although, since we are  
19 the movant, it would be our position at this  
20 particular time that according to Illinois law the  
21 relevant testimony goes, in fact, as is to what is  
22 in the mind of the police at the time, and I  
23 believe that this is the issue that is outlined in  
24 our motion.

1           We would ask, as an offer of proof, that  
2 Mr. Ronkowski tell this Court how, in fact, this  
3 gentleman's testimony goes relevantly at what is  
4 in the mind of the Chicago Police Department when,  
5 in fact, they arrested, at his house, my client.

6           THE COURT: Mr. Ronkowski.

7           MR. RONKOWSKI: The defendant testified that  
8 he was dragged out of his house in handcuffs.

9           Here is a witness that was part of the  
10 crowd that observed the defendant walk to the  
11 squad car without handcuffs, and can describe what  
12 was happening at the scene when the defendant  
13 requested from the police transportation from the  
14 crowd that was outside of his house.

15           MS. PLACEK: Well, Judge, if it pleases the  
16 Court, I believe that the officer testified that  
17 the conversation that the police allegedly stated  
18 is that the request for transportation took place  
19 inside the house.

20           Is Mr. Ronkowski now claiming that this  
21 gentleman was, in fact, in the house?

22           And, secondly, Judge, if that's true, I  
23 would suggest that the fact the police described  
24 it not as a crowd but as a mob who was not only



1 attacking the defendant, but as a crowd, this  
2 gentleman who is testifying might, in fact, be  
3 putting himself in jeopardy of incriminating  
4 himself as to mob violence.

5 THE COURT: That's the witness' objection; not  
6 yours.

7 MS. PLACEK: I understand, Judge.

8 THE COURT: I'm going to hear the testimony  
9 of the witness.

10 If it turns out that it's not relevant,  
11 I will entertain your motion to strike it.

12 MS. PLACEK: Thank you.

13 THE COURT: But until I hear it, it's rather  
14 difficult for me to know whether it's going to be  
15 relevant or not.

16 You may proceed.

17 MR. RONKOWSKI: Has the witness been sworn?

18 THE CLERK: Yes.

19 MR. RONKOWSKI: Thank you.

20

21

22

23

24

1 JAMES CHRISTOPHER HILL,  
2 a witness called by the Respondent on the Motion  
3 to Quash Arrest, having been first duly sworn, was  
4 examined and testified as follows:

5 DIRECT EXAMINATION

6 BY

7 MR. RONKOWSKI:

8 Q State your name, please.

9 A James Christopher Hill.

10 Q And spell your last name for the court  
11 reporter.

12 A H-i-l-l.

13 Q And how old are you?

14 A I'm 25 years of age.

15 Q Where do you live, sir?

16 A I live at 10530 South State.

17 Q Now, referring your attention to August  
18 8th, 1988, shortly after 8:30 p.m., do you recall  
19 where you were at?

20 A Shortly after 8:30?

21 I was -- We -- I was on my way over to  
22 Mr. Hendricks' house because we had word --

23 MS. PLACEK: Objection.

24 THE COURT: The objection is sustained as to

1 why.

2 MR. RONKOWSKI: Q And did you arrive in the  
3 vicinity of Mr. Hendricks' house?

4 THE WITNESS: A Yes, I did.

5 Q Is that the defendant who is seated in  
6 the courtroom?

7 A Yes, it is.

8 Q And did you arrive at that location with  
9 anybody?

10 A Just myself and an uncle of mine.

11 Q What happened after you got there?

12 A We got there in pretty much of an  
13 uproar, there was a lot of guys --

14 MS. PLACEK: Objection to uproar, Judge.

15 THE COURT: Objection sustained.

16 THE WITNESS: A A lot of people gathered  
17 around.

18 MR. RONKOWSKI: Q And how many people were  
19 gathering around outside of the defendant's house?

20 A Had to be about two or three dozen, 25,  
21 30 people.

22 Q And after that crowd gathered around,  
23 did any police arrive?

24 A Yes, they did.

1 Q Could you describe to the Court what you  
2 observed after the police arrived?

3 A When the police arrived, they came  
4 through the crowd, proceeding to Mr. Hendricks'  
5 home.

6 They got up to the door, there was a  
7 lady that opened the door, and Mr. Hendricks was  
8 coming out.

9 He came out into the police -- He  
10 walked into the police, and they walked --  
11 escorted him right to the car, to the police car.

12 Q Did the defendant have any handcuffs on  
13 at that time?

14 A No, he did not.

15 Q Did he have anything else in his hands?

16 A Yes, he was smoking a cigarette.

17 Q When you saw the defendant smoking a  
18 cigarette, what did you do?

19 A I was more or less upset because he --

20 MS. PLACEK: Objection.

21 THE WITNESS: A In my opinion, he was --

22 MS. PLACEK: Objection.

23 THE COURT: The objection is sustained.

24 MR. RONKOWSKI: Q Were you related to the

1 victim in this case?

2 THE WITNESS: A Yes, I was.

3 Q What's your relationship with the  
4 victim?

5 A She was my cousin.

6 Q Where were you standing when the  
7 defendant walked past you, smoking a cigarette?

8 A I was standing on the inside of his  
9 front lawn.

10 Q Did you do anything as the defendant  
11 walked past you?

12 A Yes.

13 I had a board in my hand. I proceeded to  
14 hit him.

15 Q What happened?

16 A Well, the policeman restrained me and  
17 gave me a verbal warning.

18 And I stood back and watched him get in  
19 the car. Untouched, or anything else.

20 Q And you remember what position in the  
21 vehicle the defendant got in the car?

22 A Yes, he got in the back seat.

23 Q Was he alone?

24 A Yes, he was.

1 Q Okay. And did some detectives sit in  
2 the front seat?

3 A Yes.

4 Q Where did they go?

5 A They left.

6 Q Okay, were there other police officers  
7 there besides those two?

8 A Yes, it was.

9 Q Approximately how many?

10 A About four or five.

11 Q Now, that crowd of two to three dozen  
12 you described, was that crowd noisy?

13 A Yeah, pretty much. Pretty much noisy.  
14 Everyone was more or less relieved that --

15 MS. PLACEK: Objection.

16 THE COURT: Objection sustained.

17 MR. RONKOWSKI: Your witness.

18

19 CROSS EXAMINATION

20 BY

21 MS. PLACEK:

22 Q Mr. Hill, when were you contacted that  
23 you testify in this motion?

24 A I received a letter last week sometime.

1           Q       Sir, when you say you received a letter,  
2 did you receive a letter from the police  
3 department or the State's Attorney's office?

4           A       The State's Attorney's office.

5           Q       And you were never contacted to testify  
6 in this motion before that time; correct?

7           A       No.

8                   I received a letter, year, one before  
9 that.

10          Q       Well, let me ask you this:     Where are  
11 those letters today?

12          A       I have one now with me.

13          Q       Is that the one you received after  
14 February 27th, 1990?

15          A       Yes.

16          Q       Thank you.

17                   Let's also talk a little about your  
18 assault of my client.

19                   You hit him with a stick, according to  
20 your testimony today; correct?

21          A       No, ma'am, I did not hit him with a  
22 stick.

23          Q       You tried to hit him with a stick;  
24 correct?

1 A Yes, ma'am.

2 Q And you know that's against the law,  
3 didn't you?

4 A Yes, ma'am.

5 Q And you were ready to violate the law;  
6 correct?

7 A Yes, ma'am.

8 Q And the police saw you violate the law;  
9 correct?

10 A Yes, ma'am.

11 Q And you made yourself known to the  
12 police at that time and date, didn't you?

13 A Yes, ma'am.

14 Q You told them your name, correct?

15 A Pardon me?

16 Q You told them your name?

17 A At the time he was going to get hit with  
18 the stick?

19 Q That's right.

20 A No, no.

21 Q So in other words, when was the first  
22 time you told anyone that on that date and time  
23 that you tried to hit the defendant with a stick?

24 A I'd say about last month.



1 Q Last month?

2 And who did you tell?

3 A I told the State's Attorney.

4 Q The State's Attorney, or the young lady  
5 sitting with him?

6 A The State's Attorney.

7 Q This State's Attorney -- And were there  
8 Chicago Police Officers there at the time when you  
9 were having this conversation?

10 A Yes, there were.

11 Q And as a matter of fact you had heard  
12 already that this defendant had testified that  
13 there was no mob in front of his house; correct?

14 A No, ma'am.

15 Q Well, let's talk a little further.

16 When did you have this conversation with  
17 Mr. Ronkowski?

18 A It was during the first summons that I  
19 had.

20 Q The first --

21 A The first court summons that I had, when  
22 I came in. It was last month.

23 Q Last month?

24 A Yes.

1 Q When, last month?

2 A I think it was on the 27th. I'm not  
3 sure.

4 Q The 27th of February?

5 A Right.

6 Q When did you have the conversation with  
7 Mr. Ronkowski? What time?

8 A I can't recall.

9 Q Where was the conversation with Mr.  
10 Ronkowski?

11 A It was here.

12 Q By the way, those police officers that  
13 you were -- You saw police officers here when you  
14 had that conversation with Mr. Ronkowski;  
15 correct?

16 A Uh-huh.

17 Q Does "uh-huh" mean "yes"?

18 A Yes, ma'am.

19 Q Thank you.

20 Let me ask you also this:

21 Can you name any of those police  
22 officers?

23 A No, I cannot.

24 Q Was one of them a Detective Malla?

1 A No. I can't name whoever those --

2 Q Were they white or black?

3 A They were white.

4 Q Let me ask you this:

5 When you were attempting to hit my  
6 client with a stick -- You are familiar with a  
7 gentleman from TV called Russ Ewing; correct?

8 A Yes, ma'am.

9 Q Did you see Russ Ewing present at that  
10 time?

11 A No, I can't recall now.

12 Q Did you see anyone filming this  
13 incident, sir, if you can recall?

14 A No, ma'am, I can't recall.

15 Q When you say you can't recall, does that  
16 mean you don't know?

17 You didn't see it, or your memory is  
18 exhausted?

19 A I wasn't paying attention.

20 MR. RONKOWSKI: Objection. Compound  
21 question.

22 THE COURT: Objection overruled.

23 MS. PLACEK: Q Beg pardon?

24 THE WITNESS: A I wasn't paying any

1 attention for any newspaper reporters or cameramen  
2 there.

3 Q Thank you.

4 By the way, it is your testimony today  
5 that the door was not open, that someone opened  
6 the door, a female; correct?

7 A Of his household. Someone from his  
8 household opened the door.

9 Q And you saw, as soon as -- According to  
10 what you are saying today, as soon as the female  
11 of the household opened the door, you are --  
12 according to your testimony -- the police didn't  
13 even bother entering the house, that my client, Mr.  
14 Hendricks, came right out of the house; correct?

15 A Yes, ma'am.

16 Q And not only that, but the police didn't  
17 even bother coming in, but there was no one --  
18 Well, may I withdraw and rephrase?

19 They went straight into the squad car;  
20 correct?

21 A Yes, ma'am.

22 Q Thank you.

23 By the way, you stated that it was your  
24 cousin who is the victim of this crime, correct?

1 A Correct, ma'am.

2 Q And you want to avenge your cousin,  
3 don't you?

4 A I want to see justice, ma'am. Vengeance  
5 is not the point.

6 Q Well, let's talk about that for a  
7 second.

8 When you say you want to see justice,  
9 name someone else besides a member of your family  
10 who was a part of that alleged mob?

11 A Larry Smith.

12 Q And where does Larry Smith live?

13 A 11720 South Princeton.

14 Q Thank you, sir.

15 When you first arrived, was the police  
16 officers there?

17 A No, they were not.

18 Q Was there anybody preventing you from  
19 going or knocking on the door of the house?

20 A No, there wasn't.

21 Q Were you throwing stones -- Were you  
22 personally throwing stones at the house?

23 A No, ma'am.

24 Q Were you shouting when you first

1 arrived?

2 A No, ma'am.

3 Q Did you ring the door bell and say:  
4 Come on out, Jerome Hendricks, you killed my  
5 cousin?

6 A No, ma'am.

7 Q So according to your testimony, as it is  
8 today, you didn't start your action of trying to  
9 assault my client until the police came; correct?  
10 And brought him out of the -- Or rather, he came  
11 out of the house; correct?

12 A Yes, ma'am.

13 Q Where did you get the stick?

14 A I don't know. Maybe I picked it up on  
15 the side, whatever.

16 Q When you picked it up -- What kind of  
17 stick was it?

18 A It was a board.

19 Q Where did you get the board?

20 A I don't remember.

21 Q How long of a board?

22 A About seven inch board.

23 Q Seven inches thick, seven inches long,  
24 seven inches wide?

1           A       Seven inches long.

2           Q       Did you hold on to that board even after  
3 the police drove away?

4           A       No, ma'am.

5           Q       Thank you.

6                    You said you saw Mr. Hendricks come out  
7 smoking a cigarette?

8           A       Correct.

9           Q       And when you say you saw him coming out  
10 smoking a cigarette, I believe you also stated  
11 that he did not have handcuffs on, is that  
12 correct?

13          A       Correct.

14          Q       Well, let me ask you this, sir:

15                   Where were the police officers in  
16 relationship to Mr. Hendricks when he came out of  
17 the house?

18          A       Pardon?

19          Q       Where were the police officers in  
20 relationship to Mr. Hendricks, when he came out of  
21 the house?

22          A       The police officers, they was in the  
23 walkway.

24          Q       So they never even came out on the

1 porch?

2 A Yeah, that was about two, three  
3 scattered on the porch.

4 Q But they never really completed being on  
5 the porch; correct?

6 A No -- correct.

7 Q Thank you.

8 MS. PLACEK: Thank you, your Honor. That's  
9 all.

10

11 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

12 BY

13 MR. RONKOWSKI:

14 Q Why did you swing this object at the  
15 defendant?

16 MS. PLACEK: Objection.

17 THE COURT: The objection is sustained.

18 MR. RONKOWSKI: Nothing further.

19

20 EXAMINATION

21 BY

22 THE COURT:

23 Q Mr. Hill, other than the members of your  
24 family and Mr. Larry Smith, who else was a member



1 of the mob that you say was outside the  
2 defendant's home?

3 A The majority of the neighborhood was  
4 there.

5 The names --

6 Q Do you know any of them? Did you  
7 recognize any of them?

8 A Yes, I did. But the names, as far as  
9 first name and last name, I can't recall.

10 Everybody over there have nicknames.

11 Q Well, do you know any of the nicknames  
12 of any of the persons that were there?

13 A Yes.

14 There was a young lady called Paulette.

15 Q Where does Paulette live?

16 A I don't know the precise address.

17 Q In what vicinity?

18 A She stays on the other side of 117th,  
19 but it was on 117th.

20 Q When you say the other side, be more  
21 specific.

22 A Say across the street, two doors --  
23 two doors over and a street over from Jerome. I  
24 don't know the precise address.

1 Q Can you be more specific than across the  
2 street and two doors over?

3 A It was on the southwest corner.

4 Q Of what?

5 A Of 117th.

6 Q And what?

7 A And Princeton.

8 Q How long have you known her?

9 A Not too long.

10 Q How long is that?

11 A About two years, one year.

12 Q Do you know the house in which she lives  
13 in?

14 A Yes, I do.

15 Q Have you ever been asked by anyone at  
16 all to identify some of the other persons, or  
17 locate some of the other persons that you say was  
18 present at that time?

19 A No.

20 Q Where were you standing when you say the  
21 defendant exited his house?

22 A I was standing inside his gate.

23 Q How far away from the door or the  
24 entrance to his home?

1 A About 10 feet.

2 Q You had a clear and unobstructed view of  
3 his doorway, I take it?

4 A Yes, sir.

5 Q Who else did you see in the defendant's  
6 home or exiting his home at that time?

7 A No one but the defendant, your Honor. I  
8 seen him exiting by himself.

9 I seen the young lady open the door.

10 Q Where were the police at that time?

11 A They were standing right there, at the  
12 door.

13 Q Right where?

14 A Right at the door.

15 As soon as you walk to the entrance,  
16 it's like --

17 Q He walked right out of the door into the  
18 arms of the police; is that right?

19 A Yes, sir.

20 Q What did the police do when that  
21 occurred?

22 A Well, they just turned, walked with him  
23 to the police car.

24 He exited -- When he came out, there

1 was a few words said that I couldn't hear.

2 When he came out, they turned and walked  
3 to the car.

4 THE COURT: Mr. Ronkowski, do you have  
5 anything in relationship to what I have just asked  
6 him?

7 MR. RONKOWSKI: No.

8 THE COURT: Ms. Placek?

9 MS. PLACEK: No, your Honor.

10 Thank you.

11 THE COURT: You may step down, Mr. Hill.

12 You may also remain in the courtroom if  
13 you desire.

14 (Witness excused)

15 Call your next witness.

16 MS. MALLO: Your Honor, at this time the  
17 People would call Detective Mike Baker.

18 THE CLEKR: Raise your right hand, sir.

19 (Witness sworn)

20 THE COURT: You may proceed.

21 MS. MALLO: Thank you, Judge.  
22  
23  
24

1  
2 DET. MICHAEL BAKER,  
3 a witness called by the Respondent, the People of  
4 the State of Illinois herein, having been first  
5 duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

6 DIRECT EXAMINATION

7 BY

8 MS. MALLO:

9 Q Detective, could you state your name and  
10 spell your last name?

11 A Detective Michael Baker, B-a-k-e-r, star  
12 number 10414, City of Chicago Police Department,  
13 Area 2, Violent Crimes Unit.

14 Q And, Detective, on the 8th of August,  
15 1988, you were then working as a detective in Area  
16 2, Violent Crimes?

17 A Yes, I was.

18 Q At about 8:30 in the evening of August  
19 8th, 1988, were you at Area 2?

20 A Yes, I was.

21 Q About 8:30, what happened?

22 A There was a phone call came into the  
23 office. It was taken by Detective Nitsche.

24 It was a call from Jerome Hendricks --

1 MS. PLACEK: Objection as to the content of  
2 the conversation.

3 THE COURT: Overruled.

4 MS. PLACEK: (Continuing) -- of the  
5 conversation, without foundation.

6 THE COURT: Well, you can lay a better  
7 foundation.

8 MS. MALLO: Q Yes, sir.

9 This was at Area 2, about 8:30 in the  
10 evening on August 8th, 1988?

11 THE WITNESS: A Yes, it was.

12 Q Do you recall what room you were in?

13 A I was in our office; no particular  
14 room, just the office.

15 Q And you were present, and Detective  
16 Nitsche was present?

17 A Yes, I was.

18 Q And anyone else?

19 A There was a lot of detectives in the  
20 room. I don't remember all of them.

21 Q When Detective Nitsche answered the  
22 phone -- He answered the phone?

23 A Yes, he did.

24 Q And did he -- What happened then?

1           A       He talked on the phone for a few  
2 minutes, hung the phone up, and then I had a brief  
3 conversation with him.

4           Q       What did he say to you?

5           A       He said that that was Jerome Hendricks,  
6 and that he was home, wanted to talk to us.

7           Q       So after you received that phone call at  
8 Area 2 Headquarters, what did you then do?

9           A       I went over to 255 West 117th Street, to  
10 Jerome Hendricks' house.

11          Q       Once you arrived at that address,  
12 Detective Baker, what happened next?

13          A       When I got there, there was a large  
14 crowd there.

15                   And I stayed out front, in front of the  
16 house there.

17                   Detective Nitsche walked up to the  
18 house.    There was a woman in the doorway who  
19 opened the door, and he went in and came back out  
20 about 20 seconds with Jerome Hendricks walking  
21 behind him.

22          Q       And when Jerome Hendricks walked from  
23 that house, what happened then?

24          A       He was walking to the squad car with

1 Detective Nitsche, and there was a large crowd had  
2 gathered around, and someone in the crowd swung a  
3 stick at him, and he hurried over and got in the  
4 back seat of Detective Nitsche's squad car.

5 Q When you say he, you're referring to the  
6 defendant, Jerome Hendricks?

7 A Jerome Hendricks.

8 Q Detective Baker, do you see Jerome  
9 Hendricks in court today?

10 A That gentleman on the end.

11 MS. PLACEK: I would stipulate to the  
12 identification of the defendant.

13 MS. MALLO: Q Your Honor, we would accept  
14 that stipulation as the in-court identification of  
15 the defendant.

16 After Hendricks got into the squad, then  
17 what happened?

18 THE WITNESS: A He was transported into  
19 Area 2.

20 Q After he got to Area 2, what happened?

21 A He was interviewed by Detective Nitsche  
22 at that time.

23 Q And you remained at Area 2 also?

24 A Yes, I did.



1 Q After you arrived at Area 2 --

2 First of all, Detective, when you  
3 arrived at Area 2, Detective Nitsche had  
4 transported the defendant?

5 A Yes, he did.

6 Q And you arrived in another car?

7 A Yes, I did.

8 Q And when you got there, you stated that  
9 Detective Nitsche had a conversation with the  
10 defendant?

11 A Yes, he did.

12 Q And after that conversation what did you  
13 do?

14 A Well, after the conversation, Detective  
15 Nitsche allowed him to use the phone, make several  
16 phone calls.

17 Then after he was almost done with the  
18 phone calls, I had a conversation with Detective  
19 Nitsche and he told me that Jerome wished to stay  
20 and help clear his name in this incident there,  
21 and he wished to go to 11th and State to be  
22 interviewed to further clear his name.

23 Q Now, did you have anything to do with  
24 transporting the defendant to 11th and State?

1           A       Myself and my partner, Detective Rowan,  
2 transported Jerome to 11th and State at that  
3 time.

4           Q       What time did you arrive at 11th and  
5 State?

6           A       I believe it was somewhere between 9:00  
7 and 9:30.

8           Q       And when you -- Then once you got to  
9 11th and State, did you then return to Area 2?

10          A       We stayed at 11th and State  
11 approximately two hours or so.

12                   Then we returned to Area 2, Violent  
13 Crimes, about 1:00 a.m.

14          Q       And when you got back to Area 2, then  
15 what occurred?

16          A       We had an interview -- We interviewed  
17 Jerome Hendricks, myself and Detective Rowan.

18          Q       And at that interview -- Well, before  
19 you ever spoke to him, was the defendant advised  
20 of his rights per Miranda?

21          A       Before he was interviewed, I advised him  
22 of his Rights from my FOP book. And Detective  
23 Rowan was present at that time.

24                   He related he understood them, and he

1 related --

2 We asked him about the missing girl, and  
3 he told us he wished to help us clear up the  
4 situation there and then.

5 He gave us his story concerning what he  
6 knew about the incident.

7 Q And at that time did he offer -- By he,  
8 I mean the defendant, Jerome Hendricks.

9 Did he offer any information about his  
10 whereabouts on the date the girl had been reported  
11 missing?

12 MS. PLACEK: Objection to the relevancy, as  
13 to the motion to quash here.

14 THE COURT: What is the relevancy?

15 MS. MALLO: Well, Judge, I was inquiring of  
16 the defendant as to alibis.

17 I'm inquiring of the detective as to  
18 alibis the defendant gave to the detectives, and  
19 what the course of the investigation took after  
20 that time.

21 THE COURT: How is that relevant?

22 You know, what's raised here is the  
23 question of the violation of the defendant's 4th  
24 and 14th Amendment Rights, not 5th and 6th.

1 MS. MALLO: Yes, sir.

2 THE COURT: I don't understand how that's  
3 relevant.

4 MR. RONKOWSKI: According to the State's  
5 theory of the case --

6 If I can interrupt -- and according to  
7 the police reports, the defendant wasn't arrested  
8 until the next day.

9 The defendant's statements to the police  
10 prior to his arrest is admissible to show probable  
11 cause.

12 It's also admissible to show why this  
13 detective interviewed people and was not able to  
14 verify what the defendant was claiming.

15 MS. PLACEK: Well, besides -- excuse me --  
16 the State's Attorney testifying as to that at this  
17 matter, Judge, the suggestion --

18 First of all if we are going to go into  
19 what the detective is going to testify, I would  
20 ask that he be removed from the room during this  
21 argument.

22 But I would suggest that the relevancy,  
23 even though what they have stated, is an incorrect  
24 relevancy as to the points set out in the motion,

1 Judge.

2 As the Court correctly pointed out, we  
3 are not dealing with what this information  
4 supposedly at 11:00 o'clock in the morning showed.

5 I believe that what the State has to  
6 show is when the actual arrest took place, and  
7 what was the probable cause arising to it; not  
8 whether or not the defendant gave any kind of  
9 exculpatory statements at that time, Judge.

10 THE COURT: Exculpatory or inculpatory  
11 statements, it does not appear to me to be  
12 relevant to the motion at this point.

13 And let me suggest to you, Mr.  
14 Ronkowski, that the evidence that I have heard, it  
15 appears to me that one of two things is the end  
16 result of the situation: either the defendant was  
17 or was not in the police station pursuant to a  
18 valid arrest or a Constitutionally valid arrest,  
19 or he was not.

20 If he was, then all that flowed from his  
21 legally Constitutional arrest is admissible  
22 against him.

23 It is uncontested insofar as the 5th  
24 Amendment is concerned, that is Miranda, and

1 whether or not he made the statements. The only  
2 issue is whether or not he was there legally.

3 And we have him there about 8:30 or  
4 shortly thereafter.

5 What happened later on, I don't see how  
6 it is relevant.

7 MR. RONKOWSKI: If the defendant is there  
8 with his consent, voluntarily, due to sources  
9 outside the police power, as has been testified to  
10 as far --

11 THE COURT: And he makes a statement, that  
12 statement is admissible against him.

13 So again I am concerned with the  
14 Constitutionality of his presence in the police  
15 station. And that's what I think the Defense is  
16 raising here.

17 And you know, if we can center in on  
18 that as opposed to what the defendant said -- I'm  
19 not concerned with what he said, whether it  
20 inculpated him or not or exculpated him, or gave  
21 the police probable cause for the subsequent  
22 arrest of him.

23 The question is, was he validly there?

24 Do you concur with me? You look like if

1     you disagree.

2             MR. RONKOWSKI: That's one of the issues.

3             THE COURT: That's the only issue.

4             MR. RONKOWSKI: No, it isn't.

5                     And we are entitled to make our own  
6     record.

7             THE COURT: Please tell me what the other  
8     issue is.

9             MR. RONKOWSKI: Okay. I will repeat myself.

10                     The defendant is down there consensually  
11     because this crowd outside of his house is  
12     accusing him of the crime.

13                     While he is down there, he makes various  
14     statements to the police, some of which are not  
15     true.

16                     Furthermore, he makes various admissions  
17     to the police.

18                     At a point, according to the police  
19     report and the State's theory of the case, he  
20     admits to having sex with a girl who is 12 years  
21     old.

22             THE COURT: What does that mean?

23             MR. RONKOWSKI: He is no longer free to go.

24                     At that point the police have probable

1 cause to arrest him. And the police at that point  
2 do not let him go.

3 MS. PLACEK: Well, Judge --

4 THE COURT: The defendant is not in any way,  
5 as I understand this motion, raising any question  
6 as to the development of probable cause while he  
7 is in the police station.

8 They are saying, as I understand it,  
9 that his initial presence in the police station  
10 was unconstitutional, and therefore everything  
11 that flowed from it is void.

12 And on the converse of that, if he was  
13 not, they don't make any challenge to what flowed  
14 from it.

15 So again, what happened, what he said,  
16 is totally irrelevant.

17 MR. RONKOWSKI: The defendant is claiming  
18 that he is down at the police station, number one,  
19 he is claiming through his testimony that he was  
20 arrested and not voluntarily down there.

21 Second of all, they are not conceding  
22 the existence of probable cause at the time that  
23 the defendant called the police, and it was the  
24 defendant that called the police.



1           If they concede probable cause at that  
2 point, that's something else.

3           MS. PLACEK: Well, we are not.

4           THE COURT: What difference, Mr. Ronkowski,  
5 whether they conceded or not.

6           Either the police arrested him validly,  
7 which I will determine --

8           MR. RONKOWSKI: Right.

9           THE COURT: (Continuing) -- and if they  
10 arrested him validly and took him into the police  
11 station, everything that flowed is fine.

12           If he went there consensually, and had  
13 conversations with the police officers, and which  
14 helped them to develop probable cause, that's  
15 fine.

16           Again, the whole issue here is how did  
17 -- under what circumstances did he arrive in that  
18 police station. That's all.

19           The objection is sustained.

20           MS. PLACEK: Thank you, your Honor.

21           THE COURT: Put another question.

22           MS. MALLO: Yes, sir.

23           Q     Detective, during the course of your  
24 conversation with Jerome Hendricks, did he ever

1 ask if he could leave?

2 MS. PLACEK: Objection.

3 THE COURT: Objection sustained.

4 MS. MALLO: Judge, if I may have one minute?

5 MR. RONKOWSKI: Your Honor, we are either  
6 going to ask to proceed by an offer of proof with  
7 this witness, or we will ask to bifurcate the  
8 proceedings and make a separate factual finding.

9 THE COURT: When you complete this witness'  
10 testimony, I will allow you to make an offer of  
11 proof for the record, Mr. Ronkowski. You have a  
12 right to do that.

13 In the event this becomes necessary by  
14 either side, the record ought to be complete.

15 I again say to you, as I understand the  
16 motion and a clear reading of the motion and the  
17 colloquy that has gone on here in court,  
18 unobjected to, in any way challenged by the  
19 Defense, makes it even more clear to me that the  
20 issue that we are dealing with is the defendant's  
21 initial arrival in the police station, and  
22 whether, at that point, he was Constitutionally in  
23 the police station, either having been arrested,  
24 Constitutionally, or having arrived there

1 consentually and voluntarily.

2 Either of those two positions would make  
3 him Constitutionally in the police station.

4 And thus, everything that occurred would  
5 be perfectly admissible against him.

6 The converse, if he is not there  
7 pursuant to the 4th Amendment, that is, the police  
8 illegally arrested him, and he did not arrive  
9 there consentually, then everything that flowed  
10 from it is void.

11 And it could not -- nothing that he  
12 said or did could attenuate back and validate the  
13 arrest, unless you intend to show that somehow he  
14 was --

15 MR. RONKOWSKI: If your Honor would be  
16 willing to bifurcate the proceeding, we would be  
17 ready to rest in a few minutes.

18 MS. PLACEK: I don't understand what you mean.

19 THE COURT: I don't know what you mean by  
20 bifurcate.

21 Tell me what you mean. I don't  
22 understand.

23 MR. RONKOWSKI: Well, it's the State's  
24 position that the police had probable cause to

1 arrest the defendant from the get-go.

2 THE COURT: Fine.

3 MR. RONKOWSKI: The police did not, in fact,  
4 arrest the defendant until the next day after he  
5 admitted to part of the crime.

6 MS. PLACEK: Well, then, Judge, I would ask to  
7 amend, if that's their position, that they had  
8 probable cause at the time they came to the house,  
9 that they should have got a warrant, if they're  
10 holding him in custody at the police station.

11 THE COURT: In either event, I don't see how  
12 bifurcation has anything to do with it.

13 You may be right, and it may be that the  
14 Court will determine that there was probable  
15 cause.

16 MR. RONKOWSKI: The reason why bifurcation  
17 would be one way of doing this is that the State  
18 also is entitled to go by the fact -- And I'm not  
19 accepting the defendant's theory of the case; I'm  
20 accepting the theory or postulating the theory he  
21 wasn't under arrest.

22 Consequently, the extra information  
23 could be used for probable cause.

24 What happens if the State, your Honor,

1 intentionally misjudged the strength of their  
2 case, and we were one iota short of probable  
3 cause, when the defendant called the police  
4 station up?

5 That's why I'm trying to make a record.

6 THE COURT: Mr. Ronkowski, maybe I'm not  
7 making myself clear to you.

8 But the Defense is not going to raise  
9 the question of a subsequent arrest of the  
10 defendant in the police station.

11 They are going to contend, and have  
12 contended all along, that his arrival was  
13 unconstitutional.

14 Now, they are not at all suggesting that  
15 after he arrived, and after they had conversations  
16 with him, that the police did not even then have  
17 probable cause to arrest him the following  
18 morning.

19 That's not their position.

20 Their position is that because they  
21 talked to him and learned some things and had some  
22 statements, all of that is unconstitutional and  
23 impermissible. So you don't have to worry about  
24 the next day's arrest.

1 Nobody's going to challenge it.

2 MR. RONKOWSKI: I think I understand the  
3 Court's position.

4 THE COURT: Good.

5 I have tried to make it as clear as I  
6 understand it.

7 You know, I have problems with the  
8 language sometimes, Mr. Ronkowski, but that's the  
9 best I can say it, to my mind. And perhaps I am  
10 incorrect.

11 But to my mind it's very clear what  
12 they're saying.

13 And I understand it, and I would like to  
14 discuss it with you further to help you understand  
15 it, but I don't know if I can. You may not be  
16 able to do that.

17 MR. RONKOWSKI: Well, I know whatever  
18 happens one side or the other will be taking an  
19 appeal, and I want to make sure the Appellate  
20 Court is aware of all the viable theories, whether  
21 we are prosecuting the appeal or defending the  
22 appeal.

23 THE COURT: I understand.

24 And I'm going to give you an opportunity

1 to make an offer of proof when you finish the  
2 examination of this witness.

3 Put another question.

4 MS. MALLO: Judge, if I may have one minute?

5 Your Honor, I have no further questions  
6 of Detective Baker.

7 MS. PLACEK: May I inquire, Judge, very  
8 briefly?

9 THE COURT: You may.

10

11 CROSS EXAMINATION

12 BY

13 MS. PLACEK:

14 Q Detective Baker, I noticed when you  
15 walked in the courtroom you were reading something  
16 similar to the file that I am holding in my hand;  
17 correct?

18 For the purpose of the record, the  
19 witness held up the file.

20 Would I be correct in assuming that  
21 those are, in fact, the police reports generated  
22 by this case?

23 THE WITNESS: A copy of some of them.

24 Q A copy of some of them.

1                   Would it be correct in saying that you  
2 read those police reports in order to refresh your  
3 memory?

4           A       Yes, it would.

5           Q       Would it be correct in saying quite  
6 frankly as you sit there now you have no additions  
7 or corrections as to any of the police reports  
8 that, in fact, you have read?

9           A       Correct.

10          Q       Now, let's talk about this for a minute:  
11                   Am I correct -- and please feel free to  
12 correct me if I am wrong -- that in order to take  
13 a police report correctly, you put down all  
14 relevant and all important things?

15          A       Correct.

16          Q       And something like a mob of 30 or 40  
17 people in front of a house of a suspect is an  
18 important thing; correct?

19          A       Depends on who the mob is after.

20          Q       Well, if they are after the defendant,  
21 or the supposed suspect, or the reason that you  
22 are there; correct?

23          A       Correct.

24          Q       And as a matter of fact, isn't it true



1 and correct that in none of the Chicago Police  
2 Department's reports generated off of this case,  
3 there is no mention of any mob in front of the  
4 house?

5 A Correct.

6 Q As a matter of fact, you yourself wrote  
7 a report in this matter; correct?

8 A Yes.

9 Q And you don't mention any 30, 40 -- you  
10 don't even mention any disturbance in front of the  
11 defendant's house; is that correct?

12 A That's correct.

13 Q It's not only correct, but you don't  
14 even mention this incident about somebody holding  
15 up a stick and trying to hit the defendant;  
16 correct?

17 A Correct.

18 Q As a matter of fact, let me ask you,  
19 Detective, when was the first time that you heard  
20 anyone say that they were the one who held on to  
21 the stick and tried to hit the defendant as he  
22 left that house?

23 A I didn't --

24 MR. RONKOWSKI: Objection.

1 MS. PLACEK: Q If you heard it at all.

2 MR. RONKOWSKI: Irrelevant, what he heard.

3 He saw it.

4 MS. PLACEK: Judge, I'm asking, heard saying  
5 that he did it.

6 THE COURT: Objection overruled.

7 MS. PLACEK: Thank you.

8 THE WITNESS: A I saw someone in the crowd  
9 raise a stick.

10 I don't need to hear somebody say  
11 anything; I saw it.

12 MS. PLACEK: Motion to strike, Judge, as not  
13 responsive.

14 THE COURT: The motion is sustained.  
15 Stricken.

16 MS. PLACEK: Thank you.

17 Q Officer, when was the first time you  
18 heard anyone admit that they were the person who  
19 raised that stick and tried to hit that defendant?

20 THE WITNESS: A I don't think I have heard  
21 anyone admit to that.

22 Q By the way, do you know a gentleman, a  
23 civilian, supposed witness in this case, by the  
24 name of James Hill?

1           A       I know there is a witness, James Hill,  
2       to this case, yes.

3           Q       And would it be correct that you and Mr.  
4       Hill and your other brother-police officers were  
5       sort of kept or sequestered or held in a  
6       conference room back of this courtroom prior to  
7       this hearing?

8           A       Correct.

9           Q       And would it be correct that Assistant  
10      State's Attorney Ronkowski, in the course of his  
11      job, asked each of you what happened and what did  
12      you say, in preparation for testifying today?

13          A       I remember him talking to me.

14          Q       Well, let me ask you this:

15                  You weren't -- Mr. Hill wasn't asked to  
16      step out of the room when he was talking to you,  
17      was he?

18          A       I was not in the room with Mr. Hill all  
19      morning.

20          Q       Well, let me ask you this:

21                  Did you ever know, or did you ever hear  
22      Mr. Hill say that he was the one with the stick?

23          A       Not that I recall, no.

24          Q       As a matter of fact, being with Mr. Hill

1 in that room, did you ever say, my God, that's the  
2 man I saw on that date and time, that's the man  
3 with the stick?

4 A No.

5 Q As a matter of fact, you didn't  
6 recognize Mr. Hill today, did you?

7 A Not that I recall, no.

8 Q Thank you.

9 But according to your testimony, you got  
10 a clear and good look at the man who, in fact,  
11 raised the stick to the defendant; correct?

12 A No, that's incorrect.

13 Q Well, let's talk a little further about  
14 that.

15 You did see the incident as it occurred,  
16 as you drove up at that time and date, didn't you?

17 A Yes, I did.

18 Q You saw what your brother Officer,  
19 Nitsche, did?

20 A Yes, I did.

21 Q And you saw your brother Officer,  
22 Nitsche, go in that house, didn't you?

23 A Yes, I did.

24 Q You saw him stay and remain in that

1 house for a while; correct?

2 A No, that's wrong.

3 Q Well, how long did you see your brother  
4 Officer, Nitsche, in that house?

5 A He went in and came out. A matter of  
6 seconds.

7 Q When you say a matter of seconds, just  
8 so we have it clear. Did he walk all the way into  
9 the house, and close the door behind him?

10 A No, he didn't.

11 Q Did he leave the door open?

12 A The screen was open.

13 Q Let me ask you this:

14 Was he on the porch of the house?

15 A There is no porch; there is just a  
16 stoop.

17 Q So was he on the stoop of the house?

18 A Walked up on the stoop. The door was  
19 being held open, he stepped inside, he came back  
20 outside.

21 Q Who was holding open the door?

22 A A woman.

23 Q Do you know that woman?

24 A No, I don't.

1 Q Thank you.

2 Did you ever see him have conversation  
3 with that woman?

4 A He said something as he walked up. I  
5 don't know what.

6 Q Okay. How far away were you?

7 A About 20 feet.

8 Q How far was the nearest neighbor of this  
9 crowd or mob?

10 A I don't recall. They were all over the  
11 place.

12 Q When you say all over this place, were  
13 they in the yard or house?

14 A The yard, the street, the sidewalk, by  
15 the fences. People were milling about all over.

16 Q When you say milling about, did they  
17 have stones and bricks in their hands, and sticks?

18 A I don't recall what every individual had  
19 there.

20 Q Well, did some of them?

21 A I noticed a stick later on.

22 Q Well, when you say later on, did you  
23 hear them shouting and screaming as you drove up?

24 A There was a lot of commotion and noise.

1           Q       And, by the way, part of your job as a  
2 Chicago Police Officer is also to quiet such  
3 situations; correct?

4           A       Depends on the situation.

5           Q       Well, you surely wouldn't want a mob to  
6 invade a suspect's house or attempt to hurt him;  
7 correct?

8           A       They didn't invade his house.

9           Q       Sir, do you understand my question?  
10                   Motion to strike the answer as not  
11 responsive, Judge.

12           MR. RONKOWSKI: Objection to the question as  
13 argumentative.

14           THE COURT: Sustained.

15                   As to the striking, the objection is  
16 sustained and the answer is stricken.

17                   As to your objection, Mr. Ronkowski,  
18 it's overruled.

19           MS. PLACEK: Thank you, your Honor.

20           Q       Surely wouldn't let a mob attack a  
21 person's house, correct, without doing anything in  
22 the course of your employment?

23           THE WITNESS: A   Not if I could help it.

24           Q       Not only that, but if you saw a mob

1 milling about with sticks or whatever, it would be  
2 your job, as a Chicago Police Officer, to diffuse  
3 the situation; isn't that correct?

4 A Depends on the situation.

5 Q Well, the situation is of, in fact, a  
6 mob around a supposed -- as you put it today --  
7 suspect's house.

8 Wouldn't it be your job to break that  
9 mob up?

10 A Again depends on the situation.

11 Q Would it be your job to break that mob  
12 up as I have just described the situation, sir?

13 A No.

14 Q So am I correct in assuming that you, as  
15 a Chicago Police Officer, would not deem it your  
16 job to in fact break up a mob of 30 or 40 people,  
17 some with sticks, yelling and screaming at a  
18 supposed suspect's house?

19 A I don't know.

20 Q Thank you.

21 Let me also ask you this, sir:

22 How long previous to your arrival to  
23 that house were you involved in the investigation  
24 of this matter?



1 A Several hours.

2 Q When you say several hours, were you  
3 aware that the alleged victim of this crime was  
4 first reported missing on August 1st, 1988?

5 A I don't remember exactly when I became  
6 aware of that.

7 Q Could there be anything in this report  
8 that would refresh your recollection as to that?

9 A Not the specific time, no.

10 Q Well, and you say your report, of  
11 course, wouldn't refresh your recollection  
12 because, according to you, there is nothing in  
13 your report to reflect when she first became  
14 missing?

15 A I don't recall if there is or not.

16 Q Would it be correct in saying that you  
17 can't even recall what's in your report that you,  
18 as you already stated, read to refresh your memory  
19 a few minutes ago?

20 A I don't understand the question.

21 Q Well, sir, let's talk for a second.

22 Isn't it correct, showing you what has  
23 been previously marked as Defendant's 4, a missing  
24 person report, could you tell his Honor, Judge

1 Holt, what that is?

2 A A supplementary report to a missing  
3 person's report.

4 Q Isn't it correct that that, in fact,  
5 deals with the alleged victim of this case?

6 A Yes, it does.

7 Q And on that particular matter, does it  
8 not state that the person was missing on, in fact,  
9 August 1st?

10 A Yes, it does.

11 Q Thank you.

12 To the best of your knowledge, did the  
13 Chicago Police Department have information that  
14 this person was, in fact, alive on August 2nd,  
15 1988?

16 A No.

17 Q No?

18 A Not that I know of.

19 Q To the best -- Thank you.

20 Showing you what would be marked as  
21 Defense 5 for Identification. Could you please  
22 identify that?

23 A Missing person's report.

24 Q And on that missing person's report, am

1 I correct in assuming that that's also generated  
2 with the stamp of Area 2, Violent Crimes?

3 A No, it's not.

4 Q Is there a stamp saying Area 2, Violent  
5 Crimes?

6 A No, there's not.

7 Q I'm sorry, Officer, perhaps I'm  
8 mistaken.

9 It says Youth Division, Area 2;  
10 correct?

11 A Correct.

12 Q Calling your attention to the back of  
13 that report, does that report not state, in fact,  
14 that that victim was seen on August 2nd, 1988?

15 A It says from an anonymous source, yes.

16 Q The victim was seen on August 2nd, 1988,  
17 correct?

18 A From an anonymous source, yes.

19 Q Thank you.

20 By the way, to the best of your  
21 knowledge, you didn't -- Well, withdraw that and  
22 rephrase, Judge.

23 You didn't speak to the gentleman on the  
24 phone at the same time Officer Nitsche did, did

1       you?

2               A       No, I did not.

3               Q       To the best of your knowledge, on this  
4       anonymous source, did the Chicago Police  
5       Department -- speaking of the anonymous source  
6       that stated that the alleged victim of this crime  
7       was alive on August 2nd, 1988, did the Chicago  
8       Police Department in fact take action?

9               A       I don't understand that question.

10              Q       Did the Chicago Police Department do  
11       anything in response to this anonymous source on  
12       August 2nd, 1988?

13              A       Area 2 Youth Division took some action.

14              Q       Is that part of the Chicago Police  
15       Department?

16              A       Yes, it is.

17              Q       Did they, in fact, tour an area?

18              A       You have got the report, I don't. I  
19       don't know what they did.

20              Q       Calling your attention to that report --  
21       By the way, you are familiar with 109th and  
22       Indiana; correct?

23              A       I know where it's at, yes.

24              Q       Could you describe that -- Is that, in

1 fact, the area that they toured?

2 A 109th and Indiana and 105th and 6th and  
3 Wabash.

4 Q Is that, in fact, the area they toured?

5 A Yes.

6 Q And they, as a matter of fact, took the  
7 complainant which, I believe would be the guardian  
8 of the young lady; correct?

9 A Yes.

10 Q Could you describe that area for his  
11 Honor, Judge Holt?

12 A Residential area.

13 Q When you say residential, is there any  
14 truck stops, that sort of thing there?

15 A No; residential area, homes.

16 Q Is it ever known as the Strip?

17 A Not that I ever recall.

18 Q By the way, how far was that, in fact,  
19 that area away from the defendant's house?

20 A Probably about a mile.

21 Q Thank you.

22 Did you ever, Mr. Baker -- excuse me,  
23 Detective Baker -- see the defendant on the phone  
24 in his house?

1 A No, I did not.

2 Q Did you ever see the defendant on the  
3 phone in his house, call Russ Ewing?

4 A No.

5 Q Did you ever see -- By the way, when I  
6 say Russ Ewing, you are familiar with who I'm  
7 referring to?

8 A Yes.

9 Q Thank you.

10 Would it be correct to assume that prior  
11 to the defendant being taken away in a police car,  
12 that your involvement in this matter, be it a  
13 missing person's investigation or whatever, was  
14 minimal?

15 A Yes.

16 Q Would it be correct in saying that  
17 according to your testimony, prior to the  
18 defendant being taken away in a police car, that  
19 all you did was more or less didn't enter the  
20 house, and stood on the street?

21 A Yes.

22 Q You in no way, according to your  
23 testimony, attempted to arrest this law breaker  
24 who attempted to hit the defendant; correct?

1           A       That's true.

2           Q       You in no way attempted to try and break  
3 it up; correct?

4           A       Moved the crowd away to get Mr.  
5 Hendricks into the squad car.

6           Q       Beg your pardon?

7           A       We moved the crowd back to allow Mr.  
8 Hendricks to get into the squad car.

9           Q       When you say you moved the crowd away,  
10 that also is not reflected in your police report;  
11 is that correct?

12          A       No, it's not.

13          Q       Would it be correct in saying -- and I  
14 believe you described the defendant as walking to  
15 the squad car -- When you say walking, you, as a  
16 trained observer, mean that, walking; is that  
17 correct?

18          A       Walking, walked.

19          Q       He didn't run; correct?

20          A       Well, he didn't sprint over there.

21          Q       Well, he walked; correct? In a normal  
22 way?

23                   If you know.

24          A       What's a normal way? You tell me.

1 Q Well, even-paced.

2 A He walked over, walked out of the house,  
3 and right over, and got in the back of the squad  
4 car.

5 Q When you say got in the back of the  
6 squad car, is that a marked or unmarked squad car?

7 A Unmarked squad car.

8 Q Am I correct in that when you spoke of a  
9 squad car, would that be similar to a detective's  
10 car?

11 A Yes.

12 Q Can you open the back door of that squad  
13 car?

14 When I say you, if you're not a member  
15 of the Chicago Police Department.

16 A You're asking me, are you physically  
17 able to do it?

18 Q That's correct.

19 A Yes, yes. You take the handle and open  
20 it up.

21 Q Does it have a screen?

22 A No, it doesn't.

23 Q Can you open the back door from inside  
24 the car?



1           A       Yes, you can.

2           Q       Would it be correct in saying before  
3 going to the defendant's house, you made no  
4 independent investigation of this case?

5           MR. RONKOWSKI:   Objection to independent.

6           MS. PLACEK:   He himself, Judge.

7           THE COURT:   Overruled.

8           THE WITNESS:   A     That's correct.

9           MS. PLACEK:   Q     Would it also be correct in  
10 saying that before going to the --   Or the thing  
11 that motivated you, so-to-speak, to go to the  
12 defendant's house, was, in fact, a request by  
13 Detective Nitsche?

14          MS. MALLO:   Objection to motivate.

15          THE COURT:   Overruled.

16          THE WITNESS:   A   I went with Detective  
17 Nitsche, yes.

18          MS. PLACEK:   Thank you.

19                 That's all, your Honor.

20          THE COURT:   Redirect.

21          MS. MALLO:   One minute, your Honor.

22

23

24

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY

MS. MALLO:

Q Detective Baker, it wasn't Assistant State's Attorney Ronkowski that talked to you about this case; it was myself, wasn't it?

MS. PLACEK: Objection.

Impeaching their own witness, Judge.

THE COURT: Overruled.

MS. MALLO: Q Well, I spoke to you about this case; is that correct?

THE WITNESS: A That's correct.

Q When I spoke to you about this case at lunch time and today, were there any civilians in the room?

A No, there weren't.

Q And ASA Ronkowski then later joined us; correct?

A That's true.

Q And when Ronkowski and I spoke to you, were there any civilians in the room?

A No, there weren't.

Q And it was Assistant State's Attorney

1 Ronkowski who had been with the detectives earlier  
2 in the morning before I got there; correct?

3 A That's correct.

4 Q And at any time in your presence did you  
5 ever hear Assistant State's Attorney Ronkowski  
6 interview any civilian witnesses?

7 A No, I did not.

8 Q Detective Baker, on the night of August  
9 8th, 1988, when you went into the home of Jerome  
10 Hendricks, you had information about the case?

11 A Yes, I did.

12 MS. PLACEK: Objection, foundation. Improper  
13 as redirect, your Honor.

14 THE COURT: I'm going to allow that answer to  
15 stand, for what it's worth.

16 The objection is overruled.

17 THE WITNESS: A Yes, I did.

18 THE COURT: He had information about the  
19 case, period.

20 MS. MALLO: Q And at that time did you talk  
21 to anyone about this case?

22 MS. PLACEK: Objection.

23 THE COURT: Overruled.

24 THE WITNESS: A Yes, I had.

1 MS. MALLO: Q And did you know who the  
2 victim was last seen with?

3 MS. PLACEK: Objection.

4 Foundation at this time, Judge.

5 THE COURT: The objection is sustained.

6 MS. MALLO: Q Prior to getting to the  
7 defendant's house at about 8:30 on August 8th,  
8 1988, who had you spoken to about the case?

9 THE WITNESS: A Other detectives that were  
10 assigned to it previously.

11 Q And when you spoke with those other  
12 detectives, did they share with you information  
13 they had gathered about the case?

14 A Yes, they did.

15 Q And when you went to the defendant's  
16 home on the night of August 8th, 1988, did you  
17 know who the defendant -- who the victim was last  
18 seen with?

19 MS. PLACEK: Objection.

20 THE COURT: The objection is sustained.

21 MS. MALLO: Q When you went to the  
22 defendant's house on that night, you went there  
23 with certain information?

24 A Yes, I did.

1 MS. MALLO: Judge, if I may have a minute?

2 Your Honor, I have no further questions  
3 of Detective Baker.

4 THE COURT: Recross.

5

6 RECROSS EXAMINATION

7 BY

8 MS. PLACEK:

9 Q The Assistant State's Attorney, the  
10 young lady mentioned three conversations you had  
11 this morning with either them singly or together?

12 A This morning and this afternoon, yes.

13 Q Did you ever say: By the way, that  
14 civilian is the one with the stick, to either one  
15 of them?

16 A Not that I recall, no.

17 Q And like you already told me, you  
18 didn't even recognize him; correct?

19 A That's true.

20 MS. PLACEK: That's all, Judge.

21 THE COURT: Anything further?

22 MS. MALLO: No, sir.

23 THE COURT: Mr. Baker, thank you very much.  
24 You may step down.

1 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

2 (Witness excused)

3 MR. RONKOWSKI: Your Honor, based on the  
4 Court's ruling, I only have one more piece of  
5 evidence I'm going to need. And there is an  
6 issue as to what it is.

7 It would be offered under Montgomery and  
8 probably the best evidence would be the original  
9 court file.

10 I have the case. And this would be what  
11 had been alluded to previously about the  
12 defendant's background.

13 And if I could get a continuance to ask  
14 the Clerk to bring the original court file, and  
15 after the court file gets here I would ask the  
16 Court to take judicial notice of the defendant's  
17 prior conviction to impeach his testimony.

18 THE COURT: Is that file here in this  
19 building, or is it --

20 MR. RONKOWSKI: No, it's probably in the  
21 warehouse at 26th Street.

22 MS. PLACEK: If you remember, Judge, there  
23 was quite a bit to do about what was real and what  
24 wasn't real, as to this.

1 I believe that there was quite a bit of  
2 hearsay which the Court eventually sustained my  
3 objection, and quite frankly, this is why it gets  
4 rather interesting in the case, Judge.

5 There was quite a few allegations, so --  
6 THE COURT: I'm not at all sure I'm following  
7 you.

8 MS. PLACEK: I understand, Judge.

9 But I believe for purposes of the  
10 record, quite frankly, without hiding anything  
11 from this Court, what Mr. Ronkowski wishes to do  
12 is, I believe, there was a statement by the  
13 detectives that -- rather, Detective Nitsche,  
14 that he, in fact, was led to the defendant because  
15 one of the neighbors had said that the defendant  
16 was priorly -- you know, a prior convicted sex  
17 offender.

18 THE COURT: All right.

19 And I take it that he wants to impeach  
20 the defendant by introducing a prior conviction.

21 MS. PLACEK: Correct, Judge.

22 MR. RONKOWSKI: Correct.

23 THE COURT: And I take it also that you  
24 don't choose to stipulate or cooperate in that in

1 any way to obviate the necessity of a continuance?

2 MS. PLACEK: Well, if we're talking about  
3 obviating, the interesting thing is this is under  
4 Montgomery, of course, Judge.

5 We have more or less conceded that with  
6 sidebars to the bench.

7 THE COURT: I know about it. But --

8 MS. PLACEK: Judge, it's silly; you know  
9 about it already.

10 THE COURT: So I don't see the point of  
11 having to bring in the record.

12 MS. PLACEK: If this is the one, right.

13 THE COURT: This is something I already know.

14 MS. PLACEK: Fine, Judge.

15 If that's under Montgomery --

16 THE COURT: Is it admissible under  
17 Montgomery?

18 MS. PLACEK: I don't believe I have a problem  
19 with that. I have no problem stipulating.

20 THE COURT: Why is that?

21 MS. PLACEK: Well, number one, there was a  
22 problem as to the year, and there was something as  
23 to the rap sheet supposedly being wrong, if the  
24 Court remembers as to certain cross examination.



1           A certified copy, of course, would have  
2     obviated this.

3           I have no problem -- As a matter of  
4     fact, since the majority of my time is spent at  
5     26th Street, and if this is the only witness, if  
6     this is the only thing holding it up, I have no  
7     real problem stipulating it.

8           But just for -- you know, that he was  
9     convicted at such and such a time.

10          THE COURT: Well, if there is a genuine  
11     Montgomery problem, that's one thing.

12           On the other hand, if this evidence is  
13     ultimately going to be admitted, and it will be  
14     admitted if it conforms itself to Montgomery's  
15     dictates, I might as well do it.

16          MS. PLACEK: Okay.

17          MR. RONKOWSKI: Would it help if I made an  
18     offer of proof?

19          MS. PLACEK: Judge, why don't we just trust  
20     the rap sheet then, Judge?

21          THE COURT: Fine.

22           Why don't you just put it in?

23          MR. RONKOWSKI: By stipulation, Counsel?

24          MS. PLACEK: That's fine.

1 MR. RONKOWSKI: Okay. Pursuant to People  
2 versus Montgomery, the stipulation the People  
3 would offer the Defendant's following felony  
4 conviction within the last 10 years for the sole  
5 purpose at this time to impeach him.

6 The additional information we'll rely on  
7 for the reasons.

8 In that on October 18, 1985, the  
9 defendant in Court, Jerome Hendricks, was  
10 convicted of the crime of aggravated criminal  
11 sexual assault, Case No. 84-10287.

12 On a finding of guilty he received six  
13 years, Illinois Department of Corrections, by  
14 Judge Boheric. That would be in the County of  
15 Cook, State of Illinois.

16 MS. PLACEK: So stipulated, your Honor.

17 THE COURT: Do you have any further  
18 witnesses?

19 MR. RONKOWSKI: Based on the Court's previous  
20 ruling limiting the issues, we would have no  
21 further witnesses.

22 THE COURT: You may make an offer of proof as  
23 to the testimony of Mr. Baker that was not allowed  
24 in evidence, if you desire to do so at this time.

1 MR. RONKOWSKI: Okay.

2 The Detective's -- Detective Baker  
3 would testify as to the statements of the  
4 defendant. And if the Court wishes to bifurcate  
5 the hearing to settle the first issue, that's  
6 fine.

7 If you want a full offer of proof, we  
8 would prefer to do it with a live witness. And we  
9 have two additional witnesses to put on.

10 MS. PLACEK: Is that today, or --

11 MR. RONKOWSKI: Yes, they are here.

12 MS. PLACEK: Okay.

13 MR. RONKOWSKI: Whatever the Court wishes,  
14 bifurcated, or take a -- two more witnesses for  
15 the offer of proof.

16 MS. PLACEK: Well, would these witnesses --  
17 Can I just ask Counsel whether these witnesses  
18 would go as to the heart of the motion, or as to  
19 the bifurcation that he is requesting?

20 MR. RONKOWSKI: They would testify as to  
21 the--

22 THE COURT: Well, as I have said, the whole  
23 and only purpose of these witnesses is to make an  
24 offer of proof in the event that review becomes

1 necessary by the State, so that the Reviewing  
2 Court will know what evidence the State sought to  
3 proffer that the Court refused to consider.

4 And it may very well be that the  
5 Reviewing Court will determine that that was  
6 error, and the State was entitled to a full  
7 hearing.

8 But I'm not going to consider whatever  
9 the witnesses say as it bears on the motion before  
10 me, because it is not relevant. But you have the  
11 right to make the offer of proof, and you also  
12 have the right to make it with a live witness if  
13 you choose to do so, or you can recite into the  
14 record what it is that these witness would  
15 testify.

16 Either way is perfectly all right with  
17 me.

18 MR. RONKOWSKI: I will rely on the Court's  
19 judgment whether we bifurcate the proceedings or  
20 to get with live witnesses.

21 THE COURT: I don't know what you mean by  
22 bifurcate.

23 MS. PLACEK: I don't, either, Judge.

24 THE COURT: You will have to explain it to

1 me.

2 I'm hearing this motion to suppress.

3 MR. RONKOWSKI: Right.

4 THE COURT: And I don't consider bifurcation  
5 as even remote issue in this case.

6 What are you trying to have me  
7 understand you mean by bifurcating?

8 MR. RONKOWSKI: Well, what the Court  
9 previously stated on the record is the issue in  
10 this case is the validity of the arrest.

11 And that means whether or not the  
12 defendant was arrested at his house, and whether  
13 or not the police had probable cause.

14 THE COURT: Right.

15 MR. RONKOWSKI: Okay.

16 If that issue rules against us, if the  
17 police do not have probable cause, and that the  
18 defendant was not arrested, we are entitled to  
19 introduce evidence of what the defendant stated,  
20 and what other witnesses stated thereafter to show  
21 that at some point thereafter the police had  
22 probable cause.

23 THE COURT: How would that cure the taint of  
24 the primary illegality?

1           That's why I'm not admitting it. Because  
2           what the defendant said subsequent thereto would  
3           not cure the primary taint of the 4th Amendment  
4           violation.

5           Unless -- Unless you could show some  
6           attenuation, and you would have to have strong  
7           evidence to show that it was attenuated by  
8           somebody, some intervening circumstances.

9           But if the defendant went to the police  
10          station and there protested his innocence and  
11          there requested a polygraph, was there given a  
12          polygraph, all of that would not attenuate. And,  
13          as a matter of fact, People vs. Franklin says that  
14          the giving of a polygraph under those  
15          circumstances exacerbates rather than attenuates  
16          the illegality.

17          So what I'm saying to you, as I  
18          understand the law, Mr. Ronkowski, and I could be  
19          in error, and you know I understand and appreciate  
20          your concept that I probably am -- But as I  
21          understand, unless you have some strong and  
22          convincing evidence that something occurred in the  
23          police station other than the giving of Miranda  
24          warnings, other than the defendant's voluntary

1 request to take a polygraph, something attenuated  
2 this unlawful 4th Amendment violation, if, indeed  
3 there was one, then everything that happened in  
4 the police station is a nullity under the 4th  
5 Amendment.

6 That's the way I understand the law.

7 Therefore, I don't see what you mean.

8 And I think I'm beginning to understand what  
9 you're calling bifurcating.

10 You want me to go into a hearing to  
11 determine whether or not what occurred in the  
12 police station relates back, and cures the 4th  
13 Amendment violation.

14 And I'm saying to you that that is a  
15 burden that you could choose to undertake, and I  
16 will hear you on it, but it certainly wouldn't be  
17 on the basis of what the defendant said at the  
18 police station.

19 MR. RONKOWSKI: No.

20 When I say bifurcate, terminate the  
21 proceedings right now, and the Court can hear  
22 arguments and decide whether or not the police had  
23 probable cause, at the point the defendant called  
24 the police and invited them to his house.

1           If you rule in the State's favor, then  
2 everything that occurred at the police station is  
3 proper.

4           If you rule against the State, the State  
5 would be entitled to show inevitable discovery,  
6 all sorts of theories that, you know --

7           THE COURT: What would be discoverable? The  
8 statements of the defendant, or the --

9           MR. RONKOWSKI: The other witnesses that we  
10 talked to.

11           THE COURT: What are we suppressing here?  
12 The statement of the defendant?

13           MR. RONKOWSKI: Yes. This is a statement  
14 case.

15           THE COURT: How could a statement of the  
16 defendant be inevitably discovered and be  
17 Constitutionally violate after his  
18 unconstitutional arrest?

19           MR. RONKOWSKI: Very easy.

20           Because at some point thereafter, if the  
21 police do develop probable cause that dissipates  
22 the taint.

23           MS. PLACEK: No, it doesn't.

24           THE COURT: Come on, come on.



1           If you have any single case in any  
2 jurisdiction at all that says that you have  
3 probable cause after the defendant has been  
4 unconstitutionally arrested and within a  
5 relatively short period of time after his arrest  
6 that that dissipates the taint of the un-  
7 constitutional arrest, I would like to see it.

8           MR. RONKOWSKI: How many cases do you want to  
9 see?

10           I can cite two or three cases.

11           THE COURT: All right.

12           Start looking at Dunaway versus New  
13 York, and the whole line of cases that tell us  
14 very clearly that even the giving of Miranda  
15 warnings --

16           Look at People versus Franklin, the  
17 voluntary taking of a polygraph examination, all  
18 of these things do not dissipate the taint of the  
19 illegal arrest.

20           And simply because the investigation  
21 goes on, and outside of any statement of the  
22 defendant that causes them to acquire probable  
23 cause, that doesn't relate back to the defendant  
24 unless something else has happened.

1                   He is continuously under the restraints  
2 of this unconstitutional arrest when he makes a  
3 statement, even if probable cause has been  
4 developed in the interim between his arrest and  
5 the statement.

6                   And I know of no case anywhere that  
7 suggests anything to the contrary.

8                   Again, Mr. Ronkowski, my grasp of the  
9 law around these 50 other jurisdictions in the  
10 United States may not be that great, but I have  
11 not seen any case.

12                  MR. RONKOWSKI: There are cases in Illinois  
13 that allow the State to do that, and have  
14 successfully allowed the State to do that.

15                  THE COURT: You're going to have to point  
16 them out to me with great particularity, serve a  
17 copy on the Defense, and we will see where we go  
18 with that.

19                  So in any event, we have not reached  
20 that stage.

21                  I assure you that if I come to the  
22 conclusion that this defendant was  
23 unconstitutionally arrested, I will allow you an  
24 opportunity to make those cases before me and

1 convince me that you should be allowed to show  
2 that something happened after his unconstitutional  
3 arrest, if indeed I determine that he was, that  
4 attenuates the taint.

5 And I just don't see how that -- as I  
6 said, I don't know of any cases like that, but I  
7 am willing to learn, and I am willing to have you  
8 teach me.

9 MR. RONKOWSKI: Well, my suggestion at 3:07,  
10 rather than rush up and get you those cases, if we  
11 can pick a short date that's agreeable to both  
12 sides to conclude this hearing --

13 THE COURT: Both sides may consider wanting  
14 to educate the Court.

15 MS. PLACEK: I agree with the Court, Judge,  
16 so I will stand educated with the Court.

17 Judge, on the court date, next week is  
18 fine, Judge, or --

19 THE COURT: You are pretty close to the point  
20 of resting, absent this little problem that we  
21 have; am I correct?

22 MR. RONKOWSKI: Well, if I don't change the  
23 Court's mind, I'm resting.

24 THE COURT: Well, then I suspect, if we could

1 devote as little as an hour to this next week, one  
2 day?

3 MR. RONKOWSKI: Oh, yes, I have no problem  
4 with that.

5 MS. PLACEK: I have two rebuttals, Judge.

6 THE COURT: You have two rebuttal witnesses?

7 MS. PLACEK: Yes, Judge.

8 THE COURT: How much time do you think? Two  
9 hours, maybe?

10 MS. PLACEK: An hour and a half, Judge.

11 THE COURT: Can you give us a date that we  
12 can get in next week?

13 MS. PLACEK: Either next week or the following  
14 week, later in the afternoon, I will be here.

15 THE COURT: can you give us some help as to  
16 what's going to go and not go?

17 MR. RONKOWSKI: Call them out and I will tell  
18 you.

19 (Whereupon, a discussion was  
20 held off the record, after which  
21 the following proceedings were  
22 had:)

23 MS. PLACEK: The 10th or the 11th, I have  
24 motions before His Honor -- Or no, you are

1 putting it on Wednesday.

2 I'm sorry, the previous week. I  
3 pre-supposed -- the 3rd, the 4th?

4 THE COURT: The 4th.

5 MS. PLACEK: Are you talking about the 4th?

6 THE COURT: I'm talking about the 4th.

7 Yes, that's the one.

8 MS. PLACEK: The 4th? That's fine.

9 MR. RONKOWSKI: The 4th.

10 THE COURT: The 4th. Order of Court.

11 MS. PLACEK: Thank you very much, Judge.

12 THE COURT: April 4th.

13 MS. PLACEK: Have a pleasant day.

14 THE COURT: Thank you.

15 (Whereupon, hearing in the  
16 above-entitled cause was  
17 continued to Wednesday, the  
18 4th day of April, A. D. 1990)

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 STATE OF ILLINOIS )  
2 ) SS:  
COUNTY OF C O O K )

3 IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY  
4 COUNTY DEPARTMENT-CRIMINAL DIVISION

5 THE PEOPLE OF THE )  
6 STATE OF ILLINOIS )  
7 -vs- ) No. 88 CR 12517  
8 JEROME HENDRICKS )

9 MOTION TO QUASH ARREST  
10 AND SUPPRESS EVIDENCE

11 REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had at the hearing  
12 of the above-entitled cause on Thursday, the 31st day of  
13 May, A. D., 1990, before the Honorable LEO HOLT, Judge of  
14 said Court.

15  
16 APPEARANCES:

17 HON. CECIL PARTEE,  
State's Attorney of Cook County, by  
18 MR. EDWARD RONKOWSKI and  
MS. MARY MALLO,  
19 Assistant State's Attorneys,  
appeared on behalf of the People:

20  
21 HON. RANDOLPH STONE,  
Public Defender of Cook County, by  
22 MS. MARIJANE PLACEK and  
MR. VINCENT LUFRANO,  
23 Assistant Public Defenders,  
24 appeared on behalf of the Defendant.

1 THE CLERK: Jerome Hendricks.

2 THE COURT: Jerome Hendricks.

3 MS. PLACEK: Mr. Hendricks is in custody.

4 THE COURT: Was Mike Baker the last person  
5 to testify, Mr. Ronkowski?

6 MR. RONKOWSKI: That was Detective Baker, on  
7 March 29, and then there was a stipulation and I believe  
8 the State has rested, and it was the Defense turn.

9 MS. PLACEK: Judge, I believe, not necessarily  
10 being our turn as a result of not --

11 THE COURT: I'm sorry?

12 MS. PLACEK: I don't believe it is quite our turn.  
13 I believe we are in rebuttal now, Judge.

14 THE COURT: All right, I'm sorry, you may proceed.

15 MS. PLACEK: Thank you.

16  
17  
18  
19 (Witness duly sworn.)  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

1 DAVIDA HENDRICKS-HALLEY,  
2 called as a witness on behalf of the Petitioner-Defendant  
3 herein, having been first duly sworn, was examined and  
4 testified as follows:

5 DIRECT EXAMINATION

6 BY MS. PLACEK:

7 Q Ma'am, would you state your name for purpose  
8 of the record, spelling your first and last name.

9 A Davida Hendricks-Halley, D-a-v-i-d-a,  
10 Hendricks, H-e-n-d-r-i-c-k-s, Halley, H-a-l-l-e-y.

11 Q Now, you mentioned Hendricks; you are related  
12 to the defendant, Jerome Hendricks, is that correct?

13 A Yes.

14 Q Would you tell his Honor, Judge Holt, exactly  
15 how you are related.

16 A I am his sister.

17 Q Now, calling your attention to August 9, I  
18 believe 1988, could you tell his Honor, Judge Holt,  
19 where you are living?

20 A 255 West 117th Street.

21 Q Were you living there alone or with someone?

22 A My mother, my brothers and sisters.

23 Q You mentioned your brother again. Is Jerome  
24 Hendricks that brother that you speak of?



1 A Yes, one of them.

2 Q One of them, thank you.

3 Calling you attention to the later  
4 afternoon hours, evening hours, did anything unusual  
5 happen?

6 A I don't remember the dates any more.

7 Q I understand about the dates and the time,  
8 but were you present during that time when anything  
9 unusual happened?

10 A Yes.

11 Q Could you tell his Honor, Judge Holt, exactly  
12 what you remember happening on that date?

13 A The whole day?

14 Q Well, let's start in relationship with your  
15 brother, Jerome. Did you see your brother, Jerome, that  
16 day?

17 A Yes.

18 Q Could you tell his Honor, Judge Holt, if,  
19 during the afternoon or earlier evening hours, if that's  
20 when you saw him?

21 A Early evening hours.

22 Q I know you are a little nervous and I know,  
23 maybe you don't remember exact dates, but did anything  
24 unusual happen that evening, that would make it stand out

1 in your mind?

2 A The police officers.

3 Q Well, when you say police officers and, again,  
4 relax and just tell us what happened, what do you mean  
5 by police officers?

6 A They wanted my brother to get in touch with  
7 them.

8 Q When you say they wanted your brother to get  
9 in touch with them, would you tell his Honor, Judge Holt,  
10 the circumstances or how you came to see those police  
11 officers that date and time?

12 A It was about the girl found in the garage  
13 next to our house.

14 Q And when you say the police officers, did  
15 they come and talk to you or did you go and talk to  
16 them?

17 A They came and talked to us.

18 Q Now, when you say us, who do you mean?

19 A My son and myself.

20 Q Was your mother also present?

21 A Yes. Well, she wasn't there earlier at the  
22 time.

23 Q And did the police officers leave you anything?

24 A Yes. They left their cards.

1 Q When you say their cards, do you remember  
2 those police officers' names?

3 A No, I don't.

4 Q Do you remember whether they were white or  
5 black officers?

6 A White.

7 Q And do you remember whether they were in  
8 uniform like the sheriffs or like police officers, or  
9 were they in plainclothes?

10 A They were in plainclothes.

11 Q And you said they left their cards.

12 Did you have an occasion to have an  
13 opportunity to see those officers later that day?

14 A Yes.

15 Q Could you tell his Honor, Judge Holt, under  
16 what circumstances you saw those police officers?

17 A They came back to pick up my brother.

18 Q When?

19 MR. RONKOWSKI: Objection.

20 MS. PLACEK: Basis, Judge?

21 MR. RONKOWSKI: Calls for a conclusion. She can  
22 testify what she saw.

23 MS. PLACEK: That's what we are going into.  
24 Those are her words.

1 THE COURT: I understand that may be her words.  
2 It is somewhat conclusionary, they came back. I will  
3 decide what it was they came back for.

4 Ms. PLACEK: Perhaps I can clarify a bit, your  
5 Honor.

6 Q You mentioned they came back to  
7 pick up your brother. Could you describe exactly what  
8 happened.

9 A Jerome came in. We gave him the card and he  
10 phoned them.

11 Q When you say we, who do you mean?

12 A My mother and myself.

13 Q Okay. And when you say he phoned, I know  
14 you probably lived this over and over, but this is the  
15 first time his Honor, Judge Holt, is hearing it, who  
16 did he phone?

17 A We gave him the cards. He called the people  
18 that's name was on the card.

19 Q Would that be the police officers?

20 A Yes.

21 Q And what happened after he phoned the police  
22 officers?

23 A He talked to my sister.

24 Q And when you say your sister, was your sister

1 there?

2 A She was on the phone.

3 Q Okay. So in other words, he made two phone  
4 calls, is that correct?

5 A Yes.

6 Q After he talked to your sister, what, if  
7 anything, happened?

8 A The officers came.

9 Q When you say the officers came, tell his Honor,  
10 Judge Holt, exactly what happened, as best you remember  
11 it.

12 A He was talking to my sister on the phone.  
13 About 15 or 20 minutes later, they were there.

14 Q Were those the same officers who were there  
15 in the morning?

16 A Yes.

17 Q Were there only two of them at that time?

18 A No.

19 Q How many police officers were there?

20 A Four.

21 Q And these other, these new two officers,  
22 were they men or women?

23 A I think one was a lady.

24 Q Okay. Were they white or black?

1 A White.

2 Q And were they in uniform or were they in  
3 plainclothes?

4 A Uniform.

5 Q Thank you.

6 And again, when you say they came,  
7 tell his Honor, Judge Holt, exactly what you mean. How  
8 did they come? Did they knock on the door? Did --

9 MR. RONKOWSKI: Objection, leading.

10 THE COURT: I understand, Ms. Placek, it is  
11 somewhat leading.

12 How did they come? How did they gain  
13 entry into your house?

14 THE WITNESS: They came up and rang the bell.

15 MS. PLACEK: Q And what happened then?

16 A They came in and they put cuffs on him and  
17 took him out.

18 Q When you say him, who do you mean?

19 A Jerome.

20 Q And when you say they put cuffs on him and  
21 took him out, where was your brother when they put  
22 these handcuffs on him?

23 A In our living room.

24 Q And how long were the police, in toto, in

1 your house?

2 A Maybe five minutes.

3 Q Did they show you a warrant?

4 A No.

5 Q Did they lead your brother out of the house?

6 A They cuffed him and took him out.

7 Q Okay. They cuffed him and took him out.

8 Let me ask you this, did you have an  
9 occasion, at that time, to look out at your front yard?

10 A Yes.

11 Q Did you watch your brother get in the car  
12 with the police officers?

13 A Yes.

14 Q Did you see any riot or any mob of people  
15 in the front of your house?

16 A No.

17 Q Did you see anyone attacking your brother  
18 with bricks or stones?

19 A No, I didn't.

20 Q Tell his Honor, Judge Holt, what you did see.

21 A Just the normal people that's out.

22 Q When you say the normal people that's out  
23 there, what exactly do you mean?

24 A Well, the neighborhood, the kids just hang out.

1 That's what they looked like to me. The crowd had  
2 died down.

3 MS. PLACEK: Thank you very much.

4 That's all, your Honor.

5 THE COURT: Cross, Mr. Ronkowski or Ms. Mallo.

6 MS. MALLO: Yes, your Honor.

7 CROSS EXAMINATION

8 BY MR. RONKOWSKI:

9  
10 Q How much of the crowd died down?

11 A Well, there are people hanging out all the  
12 time.

13 Q How much of the crowd died down?

14 MS. PLACEK: Objection. She answered that.

15 THE COURT: Overruled.

16 Did you understand the question?

17 THE WITNESS: Yes.

18 THE COURT: Will you answer it.

19 THE WITNESS: Just the normal amount of people  
20 to me, that I always see out there.

21 MR. RONKOWSKI: Q Well, there was quite a few  
22 people out there at this time, wasn't there?

23 MS. PLACEK: Objection, presuming, Judge.

24 THE COURT: Overruled.